

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT



10017035220





Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

THE SOCIAL WELFARE FORUM, 1968



Wayne Vasey

88
A3
V. 95
Pt. 1

THE SOCIAL WELFARE FORUM, 1968

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS, 95TH ANNUAL FORUM

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SOCIAL WELFARE

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, MAY 26—MAY 31, 1968



Published 1968 for the

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SOCIAL WELFARE *by*
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS, *New York and London*

Copyright © 1968, National Conference on Social Welfare

Columbus, Ohio

Published by Columbia University Press

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 8-85377

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA



The Contributors

RAMSEY CLARK, Attorney General of the United States

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING, President, Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn.; former President, University of Oregon, Eugene; former Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; President-elect, National Conference on Social Welfare

JOE R. HOFFER, Executive Secretary, National Conference on Social Welfare, Columbus, Ohio

HUGH R. JONES, Chairman, State Board of Social Welfare, Utica, N.Y.

MARSHALL KAPLAN, Planning Consultant, San Francisco

KENT MATHEWSON, President, Metropolitan Fund, Inc.; Coordinator, New Detroit Committee

DAN MORRIS, Associate Executive Director, Mobilization for Youth, New York

LEO PERLIS, Director, AFL-CIO Department of Community Services, Washington, D.C.

RUBY B. PERNELL, Professor, Grace Longwell Coyle Chair in Social Work, Case Western Reserve University School of Applied Social Sciences, Cleveland

GEORGE F. ROHRlich, Professor of Political Economy and Social Insurance, School of Business Administration, Temple University, Philadelphia

HAROLD ROTHWAX, Director, Legal Services, Mobilization for Youth, New York

WAYNE VASEY, Professor, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; former Dean, George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis; President, National Conference on Social Welfare

WHITNEY M. YOUNG, JR., Executive Director, National Urban League, New York; Past President, National Conference on Social Welfare

The National Conference on Social Welfare

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SOCIAL WELFARE is a voluntary organization of individual and organizational members whose major function is to provide a national forum for the critical examination of basic problems and issues in the social welfare field.

These annual forums furnish a two-way channel of communication between paid and volunteer workers, between social welfare and allied fields, and between the service organizations and the social work profession.

Since 1874, through its annual forums and its comprehensive publications program, the National Conference has reflected the history and dynamic development of social welfare in this country. Its national office serves as headquarters for state conferences in social welfare; as the secretariat for the International Conference of Social Work; and as a clearinghouse for educational materials for use on local, state, national, and international levels.

Among the newer services developed by the Conference in recent years is its insurance program and information services, including a library of unpublished Annual Forum manuscripts; its document retrieval program, of which the data-processed production of the KWIC Index of its publications since 1874 is a part; and its Selected Bibliography service.

Foreword

WITH UNCOMMON PRESCIENCE the National Conference on Social Welfare Program Committee chose for the 1968 Forum the theme "An Action Platform for Human Welfare." The theme of the Division Program, "The Ghetto and the Politics of Welfare," supplemented that of the Conference.

As a result, there was a dual focus: one on the necessity to search for policy solutions to those intricate problems which disserve the cause of human welfare, bringing to bear in these efforts all possible knowledge and wisdom; and the other on the examination of the processes, procedures, and strategies involved in the development and the effective implementation of social welfare policy. The papers that were delivered reflected disenchantment with procrastination, and in many appraisals of current programs and policies there was more criticism than praise.

The papers selected for this volume, from among the many excellent ones presented, indicate the broad range of concern appropriate to the goal of achieving human welfare and include many proposals for change and the means by which solutions can be reached. Invited to participate in the Forum, in addition to social workers, were members of the legal profession and of other professions, economists, sociologists, urban planners, industrialists, labor leaders, and political leaders, and the papers included testify to their contribution.

At the opening General Session Wayne Vasey, President of the Conference, analyzed current welfare problems, pointed to the failure of both economic and social institutions to master the situation, and highlighted the need for change in our income-maintenance system. The Honorable Ramsey Clark, Attorney General of the United States, spoke on "the necessity for justice within the framework of order under law for the fulfillment of

equal rights of all." An optimistic note was contributed by Hugh Jones when he pointed to two positive developments in social welfare in the last decade: the entrance of the whole community into aspects of welfare policy-making and the increased recognition of welfare benefits as a legal right. Social welfare was challenged by Kent Mathewson to formulate the manner in which the contribution made by business through financial support, expertise, and manpower could be utilized most effectively. Leo Perlis indicated that "reform and reconciliation" should have priority in solving our problems.

Two papers represented concrete solutions to specific problems: Joe Hoffer furnished answers to difficulties in communication within the total social welfare system by suggesting possible communication tools which would be useful in solving basic social problems, and George Rohrlich dealt with work and income policies for the Negroes living in urban slums.

In a joint paper Dan Morris and Harold Rothwax called for a partnership between lawyer and community organization social worker, as an advocate for the client, in correcting certain injustices encountered in our social system by the poor. Marshall Kaplan defined and discussed the role of advocacy, highlighting planning in the model cities program. Ruby Pernell provided an international note in comparing the response of social workers to challenge and opportunity for action at home and abroad, with special attention to India.

At the closing General Session Whitney Young referred to the unprecedented "challenges, demands, actions, and concerns" of the 95th Forum and to the changes needed in our social welfare system, including the redefinition of basic social philosophies which would truly recognize the dignity of man and his right to participation.

The 95th Forum will be long remembered by those who attended, for there was an over-all atmosphere of urgency and disquiet. President Vasey spoke to its special character in his statement prepared for this publication, "The San Francisco Story."

A companion volume, *Social Work Practice, 1968*, will be published separately by Columbia University Press. The Division

papers, edited by Roland Warren, will also be made available under the title *Politics and the Ghettos*.

In addition to the chairman, members of the Editorial Committee which selected the papers for publication in the two volumes were: Jay Roney, chairman of the subcommittee for the practice papers, Martha Branscombe, Arthur Katz, Seaton Manning, and Jack Stumpf. The chairman wishes to pay tribute to these members for their conscientious involvement in carrying out the difficult task of selection. The committee is indebted to Joe R. Hoffer, Sara Lee Berkman, and Mabel Davis of the Conference staff for the consistent help given in preliminary planning and throughout the Forum, and special thanks are due Dorothy M. Swart, of Columbia University Press, for her supporting role.

MARY HOUK

Chairman, Editorial Committee

Greetings to the Conference

from PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

IN THE PAST FEW YEARS America has attacked the difficult and demanding problems of poverty, discrimination, ill-health, and inferior education. We have faced and fought these major social problems more openly, and more fully than ever before in our nation's history.

The complex problems we face today know no easy answers. They will not be solved overnight. Some may take a generation or more. But they will never be solved unless we continue, day by day, to build a framework for peaceful social progress.

Your deliberations at the National Conference on Social Welfare can contribute to that progress, and I am confident they will.

Best wishes for a successful forum.

Greetings to the Conference

from

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

ON THIS OCCASION of the Annual Forum of the National Conference on Social Welfare, I congratulate you on your continued leadership and concern for the social welfare of all Americans.

As Chairman of the President's Council on Youth Opportunity, I have been especially concerned with programs which would provide our disadvantaged youth with meaningful jobs, stimulating education, and enrichment through recreational and cultural experiences. In planning for summer of 1968 we have found that the necessary increase in youth opportunities will demand full use of present physical and human resources at the local level, imaginatively implemented national programs, and a channeling of private energy.

Social welfare personnel contributed greatly to the successful programs last summer. But all of us must do even more this year, and I know we can count on your full support.

Your chairman has said, "Times which produce great crises call for great action. But great actions, in turn, must be based on clear goals and effective strategies." I wish your Conference every success in this important task of defining and establishing goals and strategies to meet the needs of America today.

National Conference on Social Welfare Distinguished Service Awards

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SOCIAL WELFARE AWARDS were established by Executive Committee action in 1954 to accomplish a two-fold purpose by calling attention to the significant social problems of the times, and by recognition of the outstanding achievements of individuals or organizations in helping to solve them. The first Award was presented at the 1955 Annual Forum in San Francisco.

Conditions of the Awards and procedures for selection of recipients adopted by the Executive Committee specified that awards would be given only when outstanding candidates were submitted; that up to three awards might be given in any one year in recognition of outstanding contributions in administration, research, practice, or in exceptional cases, for long and sustained achievement in the advancement of social welfare, but not solely for long service; and that recipients need not be members of the Conference or of the social work profession.

Final selection of recipients is made by the National Board of the Conference (formerly the Executive Committee) from nominations and supporting background material submitted by the members.

Before presentation of the awards, President Wayne Vasey announced that in 1957, long before he was recognized as a world leader in human rights, Dr. Martin Luther King was honored by the Conference by presentation of its Distinguished Service Award. Dr. Vasey added his belief that the Conference membership would want him to extend their support to the Southern Christian Leadership Conference which Dr. King founded and led until his tragic death.

Awards for 1968 were presented by Dr. Vasey, President of

the National Conference on Social Welfare, to Mrs. DeLeslie Allen and Kenneth Bancroft Clark at the General Session on Monday, May 27, 1968. The citations were as follows:

For her inestimable volunteer service to the social welfare field on both local and national levels and for her interest in, and contribution to, neighborhood centers, child development, and the problems of the disadvantaged . . .

The National Conference on Social Welfare pays tribute to
LOMA MOYER ALLEN.

For his many and enduring contributions, as a responsible leader, to the Civil Rights movement and for his scholarly perception in defining ways to attack some of these great problems of this day and time . . .

The National Conference on Social Welfare pays tribute to
KENNETH BANCROFT CLARK.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SOCIAL WELFARE
DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARDS 1955-1968

- 1955 EDITH M. BAKER, Washington, D.C.
FEDELE F. FAURI, Ann Arbor, Mich.
ELIZABETH WICKENDEN, New York
- 1956 TIAC (Temporary Inter-Association Council) PLANNING COMMITTEE, New York
- 1957 THE REVEREND MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., Montgomery, Ala.
WILBUR J. COHEN, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- 1958 REPRESENTATIVE JOHN E. FOGARTY, Rhode Island
LEONARD W. MAYO, New York
- 1959 ELISABETH SHIRLEY ENOCHS, Washington, D.C.
OLLIE A. RANDALL, New York
- 1960 LOULA DUNN, Chicago
RALPH BLANCHARD, New York
HELEN HALL, New York
- 1961 REPRESENTATIVE AIME J. FORAND, Rhode Island
- 1962 THE ATLANTA *Constitution*, Ralph McGill and Jack Nelson, Atlanta, Ga.
CHARLOTTE TOWLE, Chicago
- 1963 HARRIETT M. BARTLETT, Cambridge, Mass.
ERNEST JOHN BOHN, Cleveland
FLORENCE G. HELLER, Glencoe, Ill.
Special Award: Television Documentary, "The Battle of Newburgh," IRVING GITLIN and the NATIONAL BROADCASTING COMPANY, New York
Special Citation (Posthumous): ANNA ELEANOR ROOSEVELT, "First Lady of the World"
- 1964 DR. ROBERT M. FELIX, Bethesda, Md.
Special Citation (Posthumous): JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, "Man of Destiny"
- 1965 JAMES V. BENNETT, Washington, D.C.
SIDNEY HOLLANDER, Baltimore, Md.
CORA KASIU, New York
- 1966 REPRESENTATIVE WILBUR D. MILLS, Ark.
- 1967 VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Washington, D.C.
PLANNED PARENTHOOD-WORLD POPULATION
Special Awards (Posthumous):
RUTH M. WILLIAMS, New York
HOWARD F. GUSTAFSON, Indianapolis
- 1968 LOMA MOYER ALLEN, Rochester, N.Y.
KENNETH BANCROFT CLARK, New York

Contents

THE CONTRIBUTORS	v
THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SOCIAL WELFARE	vii
FOREWORD <i>Mary Houk</i>	ix
GREETINGS TO THE CONFERENCE <i>President Lyndon B. Johnson</i>	xiii
GREETINGS TO THE CONFERENCE <i>Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey</i>	xv
NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SOCIAL WELFARE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARDS	xvii
ABSTRACTS	xxiii
WELFARE AS A CATALYST FOR SOCIAL AND POLITICAL CHANGE <i>Wayne Vasey</i>	3
LEGAL RIGHTS FOR ALL PEOPLE <i>Ramsey Clark</i>	16
SOCIAL POLICY: WE, THE PEOPLE, MUST ACT <i>Hugh R. Jones</i>	21
BUSINESS AND WELFARE: COALITION FOR SOCIAL ADVANCE- MENT <i>Kent Mathewson</i>	33
LABOR'S VIEWS ON SOCIAL PRIORITIES <i>Leo Perlis</i>	45
ADVOCACY AND URBAN PLANNING <i>Marshall Kaplan</i>	58

WORK AND INCOMES POLICIES FOR THE NEGRO IN URBAN SLUMS <i>George F. Rohrich</i>	78
PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL WORK AND LAW: AN ESSENTIAL FOR EFFECTIVE COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION <i>Dan Morris and Harold Rothwax</i>	94
A NATIONAL COMMUNICATION SYSTEM IN SOCIAL WELFARE <i>Joe R. Hoffer</i>	105
PERCEPTIONS OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AT HOME AND ABROAD <i>Ruby B. Pernell</i>	126
REASON AND RESPONSIBILITY IN THE ELIMINATION OF BIGOTRY AND POVERTY <i>Whitney M. Young, Jr.</i>	141
THE SAN FRANCISCO STORY <i>Wayne Vasey</i>	156
MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT-ELECT <i>Arthur S. Flemming</i>	164
APPENDIX A: PROGRAM	169
APPENDIX B: BUSINESS ORGANIZATION OF THE CONFERENCE FOR 1968	223
INDEX	231

Abstracts

CLARK, RAMSEY

"Legal Rights for All People"

The dynamics of population increase and technological development as the challenge of our day, and the necessity for justice within the framework of order under law for the fulfillment of equal rights for all.

HOFFER, JOE R.

"A National Communication System in Social Welfare"

A survey of the problems of communication be they vertical (within the social welfare field and the social work profession) or horizontal (between the field and other fields and the public), and the possible communication tools to be used in solving basic social problems.

JONES, HUGH R.

"Social Policy: We, the People, Must Act"

An observation of the two major developments in social welfare, and particularly public welfare over the last ten years; the entry of the whole community into the active aspects of welfare policy-making and the recognition that welfare benefits are now a matter of legal right and not paternalistic privilege. The description and nature of these two developments and the compelling implications they hold for our society.

KAPLAN, MARSHALL

"Advocacy and Urban Planning"

Unreal beginnings; growing up; benefits and costs; planning—an alternative approach and process; local government and local decision-making—war on poverty/model cities; planning process—war on poverty/model cities; advocacy—the reintegration of fact and value; why advocacy; the definition and role of advocacy; citizen participation—myth or reality; the white professional; commitment vs. ideology; determining local priorities.

MATHEWSON, KENT

"Business and Welfare: Coalition for Social Advancement"

A look at the changing picture and the promise of even more mean-

ingful change in the months and years ahead in the relationship of business and social welfare. The New Detroit Committee; the Urban Coalition. The contribution of financial support, manpower, and expertise by business and the challenge to social welfare in delineating ways in which those contributions can be most meaningful.

MORRIS, DAN, AND HAROLD ROTHWAX

"Partnership between Social Work and Law: an Essential for Effective Community Organization"

Only a partnership between the lawyer and the community organization social worker, as an advocate for the client, can achieve the changes needed to enlist the "power of numbers" represented by the poor, and to correct the injustices of our social system in relation to their contacts with such agencies as housing authorities, welfare departments, the police, and the courts.

PERLIS, LEO

"Labor's Views on Social Priorities"

Problems facing our society and the five roads we can travel. Reform and reconciliation and a study of the needs of purpose, will, imagination, skills, resources, manpower, and money to effect that reformation and reconciliation.

PERNELL, RUBY B.

"Perceptions of Social Development at Home and Abroad"

A summary of the salient aspects of "the action" and an examination of social work's responses and opportunities in today's world, among the nations today. The settlement movement in America; the Gandhian constructive worker and the professional social worker in India; the direct-action concept of Dr. Martin Luther King.

ROHRLICH, GEORGE F.

"Work and Incomes Policies for the Negro in Urban Slums"

What should the Government's policies be with regard to work and incomes for our cities' Negro slum dwellers? Terminology; problem confines and syndrome; work policies, the nature of the need and two frontal approaches; income policies; the slum as the new frontier.

VASEY, WAYNE

"The San Francisco Story"

Reflections on the 95th Annual Forum

"Welfare as a Catalyst for Social and Political Change"

Our welfare problems and suggested approaches to their solution. The Poor People's March and its significance; the fear of polarization

of American society into sharply separated and opposing groups; the failure of our social and economic institutions to cope with the situation; the need for pressing change in our income-maintenance system.

YOUNG, WHITNEY M., JR.

"Reason and Responsibility in the Elimination of Bigotry and Poverty"

Unprecedented challenges, demands, actions, and concerns of the 1968 Conference represent a moment in history—a national moral crisis demanding a reappraisal of the social welfare system to meet new needs for: (1) participation of the disinherited; (2) the involvement of youth; and (3) redefinition of basic social philosophies to recognize the dignity of man and his right to aid in the system.

THE SOCIAL WELFARE FORUM, 1968

Welfare as a Catalyst for Social and Political Change

by WAYNE VASEY

AT NO TIME IN ITS NINETY-FIVE-YEAR HISTORY has the Annual Forum of the National Conference on Social Welfare been held at a more crucial time in our national life. It is a time of change which occurs so rapidly that it taxes the capacity of the human mind to keep pace with it. It seems that within the last twelve months events have occurred that normally might have crowded a decade.

January's radical statement becomes April's cliché. Not too long ago we discovered the term "relevance" with respect to our various institutions, as we questioned their adequacy to meet present conditions. As Daniel Bell states:

Today not only are we aware of and trying to identify processes of change, even when they cannot be "dated," but there has been a speeding up of the "time machine" so that the interval between initial impetus and change and its realization has been drastically reduced.¹

Even as we meet to discuss problems of poverty and deprivation, the width of a continent away, the Poor People's March is taking place in Washington. Their needs and the program they are presenting to our public officials reflect aspirations to which the participants in the NCSW can heartily subscribe. If we insist upon talking about maximum feasible participation, we have to mean it, and back the efforts of people to improve their lot through their own efforts. As one writer has rather sardonically noted:

¹ Daniel Bell, "Notes on a Post-industrial Society," *Public Interest*, No. 9 (1967), p. 23.

The rich have always, from the early days of the Republic, marched upon Washington. They have come in carriages and today they come in jets. They put up in hotels. They do not have to erect tents in muddy flats. The poor have no paid lobbyists.²

They have had to choose such methods of dramatically calling their plight to the attention of the American people because they have lacked access to the power and influence that are available to the rest of us. We are as a society experiencing a period of agonizing doubt about our ability to cope with inequality, poverty, violence, and discrimination. Our mood today is in shocking contrast to the buoyant belief in ourselves that has been a hallmark of our national character in the past, a confidence that we could solve any problem if we put our minds to it.

The change in the national mood has come upon us with startling rapidity. The British historian Arnold Toynbee in an article last December, remarked that there has been more change in mood in this country in the past two years than in all the previous forty years that he had been visiting here. Two years ago, he commented, there was a feeling of self-confidence and a certainty that "the American life was *the* way of life, the way of the future. The world was to become as much like America as it could manage, and this was ideal." The news of the riots "hit like a bullet," says Toynbee. "It is something that would have been inconceivable even in 1965." "America for years," he said, "had a false sense of security, a false euphoria, and this is being shattered."³

In the massive outpouring of grim and fearful commentaries in the past year, one outstanding theme is evident—the fear of polarization of American society into sharply separated and opposing groups, black and white, haves and have-nots, youth and middle age, generation against generation, all on collision course. In fact, I could appropriately have titled this address, "The State of Disunion Message."

In March of 1965 the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders warned that "our nation is moving toward two societies,

² "Report of the Citizens' Inquiry into Hunger," *I.F. Stone's Weekly*, May 13, 1968, p. 1.

³ Arnold Toynbee, "Toynbee on America," *Life*, December 8, 1967, p. 108-A.

one black, one white, separate but unequal.”⁴ We are hearing from many quarters in tones of ominous foreboding warnings of the dangers of a divided society which could tear this nation apart.

It is not only the fact that these comments are being made that is important; it is also significant that the comments are coming from many quarters. The Riot Commission Report was the consensus of moderates. For this reason, it had an especially stunning impact. It was not a report of professional alarmists, and the Commission itself included representatives of many segments of American life. Newspapers, television, our magazines, radio, all feature in many ways the social injustices of poverty and of deprivation. No longer is the subject relegated to a neglected corner of public concern, or confined to stories of people who are being coddled at the taxpayers' expense by the careless administration of welfare programs.

Accompanying our fear of a polarized society of violently contending forces is a deep sense of frustration over the failure of the social and economic institutions which are supposed to cope with the situation. We cannot understand why they are not doing this. The frustration is deepened by the fact that by all the conventional indices of well-being—the gross national product, annual per capita income, the low percentage of unemployment among the working force, and other usually reliable factors—we should be enjoying a period of unprecedented national prosperity which should be reaching all of our people. But there are numerous and complex factors which add up to the exclusion of many from the blessings of this prosperous America. It has been stated that no other Western country permits such a large proportion of its people to endure the lives we press on our poor, according to a report of a Citizens' Inquiry into Hunger. “To make four-fifths of a nation more affluent than any other people in history, we have degraded one-fifth mercilessly.”⁵

Figures show conclusively that we are among the lowest of the highly industrialized Western nations in our per capita expendi-

⁴ *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders* (New York: New York Times Co.; Bantam Books, 1968), p. 1.

⁵ “Report of the Citizens' Inquiry into Hunger,” p. 1.

tures for welfare programs. In more colorful language "few people realize that our present tax and welfare structure encourage the wealthy to speculate and the poor to vegetate." ⁶

The facts about poverty are stark and terrible. The grim statistics on its magnitude vary with the definition of poverty, but we do not need a lot of technical explanations to realize that as many as 20 percent of the nation live below what we have defined as a minimal level. We sometimes comfort ourselves with the thought that our poverty is relative, but the recent information accumulated by the Citizens' Crusade against Poverty and documentaries prepared for the national mass communications media have provided shocking revelations of people without enough to eat, living in conditions as abject as those that could be found in many of the so-called "underdeveloped countries."

In the past year, one of the most significant developments has been the abandonment of the practice of blaming poverty on the poor. Not too long ago we were talking about "pockets of poverty" which were inhabited by people who had some personal inadequacies which could be improved, if not eliminated, by a few well-designed social measures. Now we know better. We do not have "pockets"; we have whole large areas. We have come to realize that poverty and inequality are, to use a term growing in popular usage, "structural." They are concentrated in the ranks of the blacks, the Mexican Americans, the Puerto Ricans, the young, the very old, rural people displaced by agricultural technology, and many others who are casualties of change.

The list of institutional failures to cope with these problems scatters the responsibility over a wide area. It includes education, housing, employment, industry, labor organizations, health agencies, and, certainly, to come close to home, social welfare. It tells a story not only of the failure of each of these institutions, but also of their apparent inability to coordinate their efforts in their interlocking responsibilities for human service. It tells a story of little support by the American society, but it also places the blame on the rigidity of response by the institutions themselves, their failures to adapt. They represent what Moynihan has called a "crisis of confidence." He states:

⁶ *Ibid.*

For more than a generation now, the federal government has been concerned about and has been involved with urban problems. However, the results of this involvement have been anything but spectacular, while the official rhetoric about them has remained altogether too glowing.⁷

"There seems to be no way to tiptoe around on the edges of hypocrisy, politeness, and of sweet reason," according to the editor of *Look*.⁸ Here is a magazine advocating confrontation and an open acknowledgment of the deep breach in our society rather than an effort to conceal the facts from the public lest they be discordant notes in an anthem of self-praise.

The Riot Commission placed the blame squarely upon white institutions for the creation of the conditions which have led to the ghetto. It has been difficult for many to understand why, in particular, the black people in the ghetto have been unable to escape through the exercise of their own efforts, as did waves of immigrants before them. It is important to realize that conditions are different; that the immigrants came to this country when a large demand for unskilled labor offered them one leg up the ladder of vertical mobility—and that they were white. Bayard Rustin has commented: "For the white immigrant, the tenement was a way station. For the black American, the ghetto is a dead end."

Social welfare is high on the list of public priorities for blame. The welfare crisis is not one of survival of the institution; for social welfare can exist indefinitely as an encampment along the byways of the social struggle, limited to a caretaker function for the stragglers and the casualties. On the other hand, the institutions of social welfare and the social work profession can contribute significantly and centrally out of their own unique experience to the solution of the critical problems which we face today. The welfare crisis, then, must be seen as one of meaningful response rather than as one of institutional survival. An institution which cannot meet its responsibilities does not deserve to survive, although I must take issue with those fiery prophets of change who assume that reform will arise like the phoenix

⁷ Daniel P. Moynihan, "A Crisis of Confidence," *Public Interest*, No. 7 (1967),

P. 5.

⁸ "A New Liberal Manifesto," *Look*, May 28, 1968, p. 28.

from the ashes of destroyed institutions. I have had enough experience with new institutions to realize that it requires very little time for them to develop their own form of rheumatoid arthritic "bureaucraticism."

It is certainly one of the great anomalies of our time that social welfare, the institution specifically created to meet many of the problems of poverty and deprivation, has had so little influence on the direction of the basic measures of reform required to deal with poverty and inequality. Indeed, the accusations against the welfare system from right, left, and center include the allegation that in the large programs of public assistance it has fostered the very conditions it was intended to redress. Such criticisms are coming from within the profession as well as from the outside. The mildest word in the rich lexicon of criticism is "irrelevant," the term that is used most frequently. While conceding that the combined efforts of social welfare have been helpful and constructive to many people, many still insist that it was simply not designed to solve the complicated problems of today's urban environment.

In fact, the criticisms show a persistent pattern. The report of a recent Arden House conference of businessmen called by the Governor of New York, after noting that the system covers only 8 million of the 30 million Americans living in poverty, termed the system inefficient, demanding, and inadequate, with "so many disincentives built into it that it encourages continued dependency."

A New York *Times* writer declared not long ago that public assistance is a disaster area for recipients and taxpayers alike, and blames the red tape that enshrouds the system for stripping the recipients of dignity and hope. Inadequate grants and investigatory methods are included as recurrent themes in the litany of blame.

It is ironic to recall the journalistic wrath which over the years has been poured out on the welfare system for being too soft on the recipient. It is easy to forget that the 1962 amendments, welfare's inadequate response to a great opportunity to assert its influence, were formulated during the period when we were being

served the malodorous dish of red herring *à la* Newburgh. We can easily recall that era in our history when large segments of the public were applauding the fingerprinting, photographing, and other forms of humiliation that were part of the welfare system. Rehabilitation was offered as an alternative to mistreatment. Perhaps we were wrong in not sensing the massive problems, so large and complex that they could not be solved by tinkering with the welfare system, but again we need to think in the context of their times.

I am not disposed here to reiterate injustices, real or alleged, charged against the welfare system. We agree, I am sure, that the time is ripe for change. While I have said on another occasion that welfare has taken a "bum rap" for the failures of the larger society and has served as a convenient scapegoat, the fact that the problems are being realized now for what they are, transcending the limits of any program, should give us hope.

But neither can we exonerate the profession as we look at the role of social workers. We have been guilty of what Eveline Burns in her presidential address to the National Conference on Social Welfare ten years ago called "professional myopia"—a tendency to seek solutions which meet the requirements of our own bag of skills rather than the requirements of the people who are being served. All professions and technical fields tend to become captives of their own technologies, a tendency very difficult to resist.

Nor can we exonerate ourselves for building a bureaucratic system which makes its own demands on the energies of people within it. I presume that we are all acquainted with the by-now familiar term of "goal displacement."

I do not intend to indulge in self-flagellation. My concern is that we have so much to offer in bringing about constructive change that it would be tragic if it were lost. We must counter the tendency of society to make social welfare a convenient filing cabinet for its worst problems, or a soporific for the headaches of social inequality.

If we are to be effective in this sense, we must counter two tendencies. One is to assume that we have no expertise except in the limited range of our own professional function. It is true

that economists, sociologists, political scientists, business leaders, labor leaders, religious leaders, and many others are needed to find a way out of our urban crisis, our ghettos, and our rural want and poverty. I submit, however, that no one has all the answers, and that again every possible viewpoint from every appropriate vantage point should be utilized. We may not be experts on unemployment, but we know the eroding, debilitating effect of continued joblessness upon personality and upon family life. We may not be experts on wage scales, but we do know about the insecurities and stresses in human relations which occur when people exist for a long time without enough money. We may not have special technical expertise on race relations, but we should understand the reactions, whether of anger or of apathy, to denial of a decent chance in life because of skin color. In our own experience in both public and private agencies we have seen the aimlessness of idle youth without goals or prospects. Social injustice is a subject big enough for all to view with concern, and for all to attempt to eradicate. And, as Mitchell Ginsberg has said, we should have been the first to tell what our programs could not do and were not doing.

As I look at the many proposals which are being advanced today, I am struck by the need to avoid the danger of assuming that there is any one solution or combination of solutions for the crisis. We could easily be bogged down in endless dispute over the best way to begin. Thus far we have seen many paradoxes. Not too long ago we had high hopes for civil rights, but the civil rights movement did not remove economic, social, or cultural barriers. As Whitney Young has said, "Negro citizens may wake up one morning to find themselves with a mouthful of civil rights but a barren breakfast table." Another paradox was expressed years ago by a writer on Social Security who declared that "life is safer but living less secure." Richard Titmuss, too, has called attention to the fact that our technological advances, instead of freeing people to manage their own affairs, have increased personal dependency and have made people more vulnerable, rather than less, to the various risks of life.

But perhaps the grimmest paradox of all, and the one most

current today, lies in the fact that at the very time that so many of our leaders are speaking so eloquently of the pressing problems of the poor, of the urgent need for changes in our income-maintenance system, and of the billions or even trillions that must be spent to rebuild our cities, Congress is insisting on economies that will cut to the bone all these plans for a greater America. We should not delude ourselves into thinking that we have true national consensus on the need for drastic approaches; in fact, we are in danger of developing a national rhetoric of dismay without a corresponding will to achieve solutions.

There is overwhelming need for some immediate action to protest to Congress on the proposed cuts in poverty programs, on the effects of the 1967 Social Security amendments, with their restrictive welfare provisions, and on the apparently dismal prospect for any increased funding for urban programs. Then there are the implications of S-17, the Omnibus Crime Control bill, which in its Title II would limit Supreme Court review of state court decisions on criminal convictions, and thus sabotage some of our most impressive recent gains in civil rights. Passage of this title could well deprive individuals of privileges against self-incrimination, the right to counsel, the right to be brought promptly before a magistrate, and other rights made secure through decisions of the Supreme Court.

This legislation, designed as it is to weaken the authority of the Supreme Court, is coming at the very time when that high tribunal promises to be an effective agent of constructive change in social welfare. It is intervening in important areas of human rights which are threatened by state residence requirements and by the man-in-the-home provision in AFDC, both of which are points at issue in cases now pending judicial review. There is a host of constructive decisions in the lower courts, invoking the Fifth and Fourteenth amendments, the equal protection of the laws clause, the right to travel, and other principles which are important to the safeguarding of human rights.

It is imperative that the Congress receive every possible communication from as many people as possible. This includes those who are involved in the administration of social welfare.

I appeal to social workers everywhere to join the crusade to get local leadership to make contact with Congressmen in behalf of urban areas, the maintenance of civil rights, and the repeal of restrictive measures in the Social Security amendments of 1967. Unless we mount such a massive campaign, we shall fail in the crisis which we face throughout the United States. And let us not forget that we do not have much time. Marginal and incremental changes are not enough today.

The second tendency which has militated against effective action for change on the part of social workers is the belief that we are powerless, that we should always get others to speak for us on the assumption that we are tainted by the brush of professional compassion, and that we are neither effective nor numerous. I say that the best way to get others to take a stand is first to take a stand of our own, and then to ask for allies. There is nothing so likely to lose allies as equivocation and hesitancy.

The issues with which we are dealing in this forum are baffling in their intricacy. Some of the issues have to do with income maintenance: should we try to achieve income equality through drastic changes in our present welfare system, or should there be some other form of income provision?

What kind of a change would be feasible—a negative income tax, a family allowance system, or some alternative?

What new alignments between business and government will be required if there is to be a guarantee of full employment? Should the government be an employer of last resort? Should it subsidize the cost to industry of training ghetto residents and of hiring employees whose productivity will be deferred?

How do we choose between the immediate need to improve life in the ghetto and the need to promote integration or escape from the ghetto? Here again is some combination of immediate and long-range actions required?

What is the best way to combine the resources and power of the federal government with the best possible use of local leadership? What will happen to the role of the states?

A question directly germane to us is: How do we make our services relevant? What do we see as the future role of the private agency in dealing with the stubborn problems of the ghetto?

Only in a perfectly stable society can we afford to wait for the technically perfect solution. This is why the theme of this conference concerns action rather than a study program. We cannot afford to wait; neither can we afford to build up too many false hopes through patent-medicine reforms or extravagant promises which are not matched by our performance and support. On these questions, I believe that the voice of social welfare should be heard.

Two points should be stressed: (1) the growing realization that the best approach is one which treats conditions in such a way as to permit people to solve their own problems; and (2) our basic interdependency as a people. I believe that one of the enduring monuments to the poverty program is the principle of maximum feasible participation. It was a shock to a society accustomed to thinking of the poor as incompetent, but we discovered strengths of the poor when we gave them a chance to show that strength in the vital processes of making decisions. As Frank Riessman has commented, one of our great challenges today is to convert the strengths of the poor into the power of the poor.

One of the best statements on this matter has come from Project Enable, which operates under the combined auspices of three national private agencies:

Enable taught many lessons. Its urgent lesson should go far beyond the confines of social agencies. The poor will no longer be done *to* or *for*. They want a controlling voice in their own destinies . . . They have resources at their command—native intelligence, perceptivity, creative capacity, driving aspirations for their children. These resources can wither away in a hopeless prison of endless poverty and racism. They can flame briefly in hate, violence, and self-destruction, or they can be mobilized into a vast new stockpile from which the other resources of this rich and powerful society can build a society for all human beings.

We must all be concerned with the great waste of human resources from which we suffer when we fail to convert the strength of the poor into the power of the poor. We need that power.

Many have difficulty in understanding the concept of black power. It arouses fear in those who see it as violence. Historically,

however, the term signifies political and economic self-determination, black consciousness, black pride, and a communal responsibility among all black people. It may seem paradoxical that a group has to develop its own identity before it can be truly integrated, but whether the effort is violent or otherwise depends more upon how it is received by the dominant white community than by the aspirations of the people who are in the movement. Integration and support of black institutions may be perceived as compatible rather than opposed ideas, when viewed in this sense.

Achievement of a place in the mainstream of society, what we have come to call "upward mobility," through political power is not new. We are familiar with the use of such political power by various ethnic groups in the past. In fact, to coin a phrase, one could say that such efforts are as American as apple pie or, for that matter, as Irish stew, shish kebab, or matzoth balls.

Interdependence is a phenomenon which we have never squarely faced. But we should. It is an increasingly important phenomenon in our lives. We are all vulnerable. We all get help. It is hard to think of very many who do not get help through government. It is time to explode the myth of complete independence. As Mrs. Martin Luther King has noted, the government subsidizes the air lines, the railroads, the oil industry, the rich, and the farmers. I would add to that list the many privileges, direct and indirect, which we receive through the agency of government. It seems, according to Mrs. King, that we worry only when we talk about subsidizing the poor.

I should like, however, to regard interdependence as a positive element in the lives of a people attempting to build a raceless, classless, egalitarian society, one which sees this achieved through a coalition of many interests and enterprises. This is the philosophy which would free rather than restrict us for the effective use of these institutions. Perhaps the time is ripe for a declaration of interdependence. He would be a rash individual who would attempt to draw up such a declaration which could serve as a governing principle to fill the vacuum in our present national policies, but I am moved to suggest a statement which might take some such form as this:

We hold these truths to be self-evident:

That in this complex world of today all men are interdependent—but that it should be the interdependence of men equal in dignity and rights and opportunities.

That we recognize fully and unequivocally that all share in the outcome of fortune and misfortune and that the consequences of denial of opportunity and rights, of poverty and degradation, can no more be isolated than can the pollution of the environment, the air or the water, from physical causes.

That whenever there is such denial, there shall be a concerted effort as a matter of consistent national policy to redress the imbalance through the effective, wholehearted, and responsive use of our political, social, cultural, and economic institutions.

That a primary purpose of our national life shall be to foster the opportunity for creative self-expression and self-fulfillment for all of our people.

That the uniqueness of individuals and groups is to be cherished and that prejudice, in all its forms, shall become an archaic form of injustice.

That when any individual in his vulnerability to the many and complex forces which surround him shall require help, he shall receive it as a matter of right and without stigma.

And that the ultimate objective shall be a unified America in which cultural differences shall enrich rather than divide and impoverish our society, and that they shall be a creative rather than a disruptive force.

This ends my declaration. I feel a sense of hope that we shall find the means to transform our rich tradition of democracy and justice into a course of action which will brook no exclusions. The years immediately ahead are unprecedented in their possibilities for monumental disaster or for great promise.

Legal Rights for All People

by RAMSEY CLARK

ANATOLE FRANCE, in his book *The Red Lily*, said: "The law, in its majestic equality forbids the rich as well as the poor to sleep under bridges, to beg in the streets, and to steal bread." In these words, France tells us that social justice is impossible where there is poverty. For this reason, those who would seek justice for all of our people must work to eliminate poverty.

There are two great dynamics in our times that make this an exceedingly urgent task. They present the challenge of our day. They cause the immense change that is the fundamental fact of our times.

These dynamics are population increase and technological development. They have created a vast turbulence in our society, a turbulence that can lead to great achievement for all of our people if we have the strength and the will to see it through, or to division and self-destruction if we are weak.

At the beginning of this century, we were only 76 million people. We were largely rural. Only 20 percent lived in metropolitan areas with populations of 50,000. A little more than two-thirds through this century our nation exceeds 200 million, a two-and-a-half-fold increase, an increase that affects our lives in many ways we can hardly detect, that tends to depersonalize and makes so difficult the realization that it is the individual who counts.

It is hard to count the individual today. A massive census in 1960 missed 5 million Americans, more people than we had in the entire country when our Constitution was written. But if we have added many people in the first two thirds of this century, it is essential that we recognize and prepare now for the fact that we will add more in the last third, and that they will live in the

most urbanized and technologically advanced society man has ever known. The urban population, 20 percent in 1900, is 80 percent today.

In technology the advance has been incredible. We double our knowledge of the physical world in which we live each decade. It is safe to say that in a mere thirty-two years scientists will be confronted with a basic field of data about the physical universe in which we live ten times greater than that known today. That is change.

Aristotle said that the universal and chief cause of the revolutionary impulse is the desire for equality. Human nature has not changed. But in Aristotle's day he could write in his own hand in a few volumes the knowledge and the misconceptions of his time. Da Vinci could do the same in Renaissance Italy. As recently as two centuries ago Descartes and the other encyclopedists, as individuals, could endeavor to set forth all of the knowledge of their time.

But by 1900 we were annually publishing in these United States 10,000 journals in the field of science. By 1950, when our population had only doubled, annual publications of scientific journals had grown tenfold to more than 100,000. He who would try to keep up today should read on each working day a volume of index without ever perusing the substance merely to cover the catalogs of this expanding knowledge. These are the dynamics that will test our mettle and test the capability of our social institutions to bring justice, wanting to so many among us today and to more tomorrow unless we act now.

There are three areas in which social workers labor, and in which I have a vital interest, which are critical to our future. First is corrections: the rehabilitation of those who have violated the law and been convicted. In this vast country, with a gross national product exceeding \$800 billion, we spend just over \$1.1 billion for all of our correctional activities, all of our jails and prisons, all of our probation and parole workers. Ninety-five percent of that goes to incarceration—to custody, not to education, not to vocational training, not to rehabilitation, not to social welfare, not to an effort to protect society in the only way that one really

can: by rehabilitating those who have violated the law. This at a time when we know that four out of five of all the serious crimes in the United States are committed by persons who have committed crimes before, nearly always as a kid, and we have failed in our efforts to rehabilitate them. We know from such venturesome and effective programs as those of the California Youth Authority that we can cut crime repetition by these violators in half. If this is four fifths of our serious crimes, one can see what an immense potential is held by corrections.

The second area is youth. We devote pitifully little of our resources and our efforts to give our young people an opportunity to fulfill themselves, to be somebody, to do something.

Take a map of any great city in the United States and chart the poverty areas; the oldest housing and the most dilapidated; the poorest schools with the highest rates of dropout among students and with the highest rates of turnover among teachers; the highest levels of unemployment—exceeding 50 percent of the employables in whole census tracts; the poorest health—infant mortality in these areas is sometimes seven times higher than that in the suburbs of that same city; where common communicable diseases for which most of us are inoculated as children are four and five times more frequent. Mark all of these on a map. Then mark the areas of high crime. You have marked the same spot on the map in each instance. This tells us that we must work with our might, with our hearts, and that we must enlist new and greater resources to rebuild our cities and ourselves. It is in these areas that most crime occurs. It is here that the young, living in the midst of vice, crime, ignorance, fear, strangers, and hopelessness, turn to crime.

France talks about the law prohibiting the rich as well as the poor from stealing bread. But the law in its majestic equality also prohibits the rich as well as the poor from maintaining tenements that are rat infested, overcrowded, or unsafe; from selling bread that is impure, underweight, old, or misrepresented; from discriminating against any man or woman because of race or religion. The law must be enforced fairly and uniformly. Until we do, until we are capable of this, we cannot expect to have that

one condition that is essential to social stability and to justice: a respect for the rights of others in the heart of every American. It is hard to respect the rights of others when one sees one's own rights violated. We must build a capability in government and in social service to see that all of these laws are fairly, effectively, and efficiently administered for the public good. It is a major challenge.

Of all the disadvantages of poverty, none so sets the mind of the poor against the social order as the denial of legal rights. There has been in recent years major progress in establishing and insuring the fulfillment of these legal rights. Because of the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the *Clarence Gideon* case, a person accused of crime now can be assured of his right to legal counsel. The Criminal Justice Act of 1964 provides resources to assure the opportunity for persons accused of crime in federal courts to hire lawyers to protect their rights. It is a tragic commentary that it took us so long to see the absolute necessity for anyone accused of crime to have a lawyer if he is to have equal justice.

But it is not just on the criminal side that rights must be fully enforced, it is on the civil side as well. We must see to it that building codes, health ordinances, safety ordinances—all designed to protect all of our people, and perhaps particularly the poor—are enforced. We need to know that the poor consumer has rights—rights that will be protected—although it is not possible for the poor under present conditions to protect them himself. He cannot go to court without legal representation. Since the creation of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the placement there of the neighborhood legal services, there has been a vast expansion of opportunity to fulfill the rights of the poor. The neighborhood legal services have in their short history more than doubled the free legal services that are available in the United States for the indigent person who is unable to protect himself. This reaches the poor in many ways in domestic relations and child custody matters which have so plagued the poor and particularly the poor in urban America. There is a growing opportunity to have rights fulfilled, an opportunity which if fully

supported by social welfare agencies can make a major difference for the urban poor.

We live in a nation divided. We must understand this. In the gospel according to St. Mark, it is said, "and if a house be divided against itself then that house cannot stand." From one part of our house we hear the cry of "justice." From another part comes the call for "order." Those who cry "justice" must know that it can be attained only within the framework of order under law. And those who cry "order" must give justice. For the long history of mankind tells us that neither justice nor order is possible without both.

Social Policy:

We, the People, Must Act

by HUGH R. JONES

“WE, THE PEOPLE,” are already acting in matters of social policy.

In recent months I have heard a great deal about social welfare—its weaknesses and its strengths, new directions and novel proposals, the bizarre and the traditional—and most of it from people who are not now and never have been thought to be part of the welfare establishment.

We have held a series of regional hearings on public welfare across New York State in which we invited comments, criticism, and advice from all quarters of our community—from the irate taxpayers, from the angry welfare recipients, from business and municipal organizations, from the ordinary citizen, as well as from the traditional spokesmen in the social welfare field. The interest of some was evidently sparked by increased taxes and concern for financial stability or retrenchment. Although one might have wished for a more positive motivation, the overriding fact was the reality of the new involvement of these people. The voices of others reflected the rising self-confidence of recipients, coupled with a determination, in the absence of adequate spokesmen, to speak for themselves. It speaks well for our community and its future that all of these people, newcomers to welfare, in a sense, now recognize and accept these matters as their own and assert their responsibility and determination to share in tomorrow's solutions. “We, the People” are a large and expanding company, and the time has come when we shall act with increasing vigor and effectiveness. And all of this is good.

In my observation there have been two major developments in social welfare, and particularly public welfare, over the last ten years which promise to have great significance for our welfare systems. First is the entry of the whole community into the active aspects of welfare policy-making and second is the recognition that welfare benefits are now a matter of legal right and not a paternalistic privilege.

Social welfare now belongs to all the people. For many years, society preferred to keep the underprivileged members of the community out of sight—"over the hill to the poorhouse." Expiation payments have been freely made to community chests, united funds, and favorite charities. The wrestling with these unpleasant problems has comfortably been left to the professional social workers and to the amateur do-gooders. On the other hand, and at the same time, the social workers, with the aid and support of conscientious volunteers, have exercised an almost exclusive jurisdiction in these areas, bordering at times on an assertion of priestcraft. Obviously, I am overstating the case, but do not let this obscure the truth of what I am saying.

As part of the recognition of the one hundredth anniversary of the New York State Board of Social Welfare, we sought to make a significant contribution to public welfare in our state and in the nation. Reflection disclosed that the industrial, labor-management sector of our community had never really shared in the "gut" planning for our welfare services. Both labor and management had reviewed public programs, had testified before Congressional committees, and occasionally appeared before state legislatures. In the voluntary field, agencies and programs approved by business and labor received corporate and labor union financial support, often very generous; and personnel from both were loaned to serve on the governing boards of private agencies. But in both cases it was participation after the fact, and carried with it no commitment to make the programs work or, alternatively, to modify and revise them until they did work.

So Governor Rockefeller summoned 100 of the top national leaders of industry and labor to Arden House in November of 1967. In effect, they were asked: "If you were free to do it, what

would you do about public dependency in our country?" They were not asked to ratify existing programs; rather they were invited to suggest new approaches, with no restrictions laid upon them. In preparation they were given three background papers by Eveline M. Burns, of the Columbia School of Social Work faculty, Leland Hazard, of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Company, and Daniel P. Moynihan, of the Harvard-MIT Center for Urban Studies. They were also furnished the necessary raw demographic data and other selected materials. The participants worked and studied over the summer, drawing heavily on top corporate staffs.

These leaders gathered in the tranquillity of Arden House at Harriman, New York, for twenty-four hours of deliberation. That conference, unique in its concept and execution, is the only conference on social welfare of which I have ever heard where people fought to get in. Indeed, there were ten arrests for criminal trespass!

First, the participants frankly admitted that they had not previously understood the welfare situation and, notwithstanding the extent of their preparation, did not then feel ready or prepared to come to substantive conclusions as to what should be done.

Second, their frame of reference was the 30 million people below the national poverty level, and not just the 7.5 million of them who were on the public welfare rolls.

Third, in sharp contrast to the punitive, restrictive mood reflected in the enactment of the 1967 amendments to the Social Security Act, the Arden House participants were clearly more interested in people than they were anxious about dollars.

Fourth, it was their conviction that a public assistance system which fails to reach three quarters of those in need, and delivers inadequate sums and inefficient services on an uneven basis to the remaining one fourth, is so seriously deficient as to call for completely new arrangements rather than for the overlay of modifying reforms, however ingenious.

A steering committee of twelve industrial leaders under the continuing chairmanship of Joseph C. Wilson, chairman of the board of Xerox, carried on after the close of the Arden House Conference to distill and report the deliberations of the con-

ference and then to make specific recommendations based on further study by the committee itself. This report was made the subject of an all-day forum conducted by the Committee for Economic Development in New York City on May 8. Beyond this, the National Industrial Conference Board, which made important contributions to the preparation for the Arden House Conference, has scheduled a two-day forum for December, 1968, to consider in particular all forms of income-maintenance systems.

In January of 1968 President Johnson appointed the Ben W. Heineman Commission of national industrial leaders to consider and report on all aspects of income maintenance. The National Alliance of Businessmen, under the chairmanship of Henry Ford II, is seeking to find jobs for 500,000 hard-core unemployed in 50 cities by 1971. The National Association of Manufacturers is distributing special material on the responsibility of the business community to participate in solving these problems of our society. The news media and business journals are full of reports of the exciting activities of individual business organizations in imaginative new programs in employee recruitment, in relocation of industrial plants, in job development, in provision of housing, and various other evidences of the ingenuity and imagination of our industrial establishment in the attack on our urban problems.

To a much greater degree than ever before, the industrial leadership of our nation is now deeply committed to, as well as fully determined to be continuously involved in, solving the problem of dependency. "We, the People" now include a very powerful new contingent. Really more important than the specific ideas which are emerging is the fact of this new alliance.

The spirit of this concern is of a character and quality entirely different from the general but superficial public reaction triggered by the infamous Newburgh plan in 1961. There was then, indeed, a real public participation, but it was that of ill-informed but fuming outsiders. That public spewing was characterized by abysmal ignorance and serious misconceptions of the nature of the welfare problem, accompanied by no determination to learn and digest the facts, or to join readily and inventively in the resolution of the problems. Perhaps the chief motivating force then

was one of bewildered frustration at the paradox of great prosperity confronted with stubbornly increasing welfare rolls and mounting costs.

By contrast, the interest and concern of the business community now are marked by a resolve to discover and weigh the facts as to dependency, its characteristics and extent. It is recognized now that public welfare does not create these problems. They result from the failures of society as a whole, becoming visible on the doorsteps of our public and private agencies. Some of the old myths as to the composition of our rolls have been exploded.

Equally dissimilar today is the commitment to share in the solution of the problems rather than merely to suppress or eradicate their symptoms.

There was abroad in 1961 a clearly repressive mood, widely held, that favored treatment of the welfare recipient as the second-class citizen he was then conceived to be. This feeling, fortunately, is no longer so pervasive.

The second development is no less new, its implications no less far-reaching. The beneficiaries of our welfare system are now becoming full participants, with legal rights having replaced paternalistic privileges. The status and benefits of welfare recipients will now be resolved in consequence of adjudication rather than proprietary mediation, however sensitive.

In these matters, quite in contrast to the usual image of the law as a stabilizing institution that lags behind a bit in balanced compensation for the pendulum swings of society's volatile excesses, the law is leading the way. I would wager that few people have any real awareness of how far our court decisions have already gone; nor would these judicial rulings, if known, be greeted by uniform acceptance or approval. Here the law precedes the conscience of the community.

I refer, of course, to the decisions that have held residence requirements to be unconstitutional, outlawed the "midnight raid," invalidated the so-called "man-in-the-house" rule, mandated a fair hearing prior to curtailment or termination of assistance grants, specified the details of due process, and proclaimed the constitutional rights of individual recipients. As Fred P.

Graham, of the *New York Times*, has reported: "Barring a stunning series of reversals in the Supreme Court, the welfare clients' 'bill of rights' will be transformed from a theory to a fact in a very few years." These and similar rulings will radically modify the traditional administration of public welfare, much of which we must admit has been characterized by a calculated, minimum delivery system on the one hand and a benevolent despotism on the other.

I was privileged to be a member of a conference in Chicago, sponsored by the American Assembly and the American Bar Association, on the topic "Law and the Changing Society." This group, including some of the national leaders of the bar, with no particular reluctance or air of heroics, reached the conclusion that "access to legal services must be recognized as a matter of legal right" and approved the use "of subprofessionals and para-professionals acting, where appropriate, under the supervision and upon the responsibility of fully qualified lawyers." The underlying discussion clearly reflected an awareness that it was not practicable to expect that licensed members of the bar alone could furnish the volume of services required; indeed, that other persons could render such services more effectively, of a better quality, and more economically. Representation of welfare recipients was specifically included in this category, and note was taken that where recipients were involved often members of the organized bar were not best suited to inspire the complete confidence so essential to the health and effectiveness of the attorney-client relationship.

All of this, accompanied by the concurrent but quite differently motivated attempt in certain quarters to bring about the collapse of the present system by a massive deluge of claims, will inevitably lead to radical changes in the administration of public welfare. These changes will be equally abrasive on occasion to the welfare establishment and to the taxpaying community.

Perhaps as a corollary, we appear to be swinging through nearly 180° in our attitude as to the delivery of welfare benefits and services. The prior posture was illustrated by the proud assertion made only a year or so ago by a local commissioner of public

welfare that he conceived it his responsibility to keep as many people off the rolls as he could, and to give those who did manage to get on as little as he could. He claimed, and I suspect accurately, that this attitude was a fair reflection of the wishes of a solid majority of the voters of his rural district. In other districts, while the approach might not have been so extreme, there was thought to be no duty to publicize the availability of benefits. While new hurdles may not have been set in the path of applicants, existing obstacles were not removed. There was no all-out effort to make certain that all persons eligible were informed of their rights. And this was entirely consistent with the dictates of the community conscience.

Now there is emerging a quite opposite attitude. The requirements of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are mandating maximum publicity of benefits. In the adoption of the Medicaid program in New York the legislature, by statute, directed:

In carrying out this program every effort shall be made to promote maximum public awareness of the availability of, and procedure for obtaining, such assistance, and to facilitate the application for, and the provision of such medical assistance.¹

To the best of my knowledge this was the first proclamation of this sort to be found in any welfare law in our state. But notwithstanding the very extensive, and successful, efforts to cut back our original Medicaid program, I have never heard one of its enemies or detractors take exception to this provision or urge its deletion.

To my mind this is simply a matter of public morality. I see no ethical basis whatsoever, in this field particularly, for a procedure which favors only the knowledgeable and dogged and penalizes the ignorant and timid.

Accompanying and at the same time contributing to the development of the concept of welfare rights have been the emergence and growth of welfare recipient organizations. Groups of recipients are joining forces for mutual support and advancement. In my opinion this movement is distinctly healthy and construc-

¹ L. 1966, ch. 256, § 3, amending Social Services Law § 363.

tive. There have been, and will continue to be, difficult growing pains; we have seen and will see irresponsible excesses. Nevertheless, there are two advantages of new and great value. There has come to the recipients a sense of identity, of self-respect, of worthiness and integrity, which is healthy and long overdue. Along with this, useful methods and channels of communication have opened up: the recipients can better tell their side of the story, and the way is also open to the policy-makers and administrators to tell theirs. Welfare rights organizations have tended to create a better balance of community forces.

So here, too, "We, the People" have been joined by a new, sometimes lusty, band of men and women and children—the welfare recipients themselves. And this is good.

Now, what do these two substantial additions to our company and their associated developments portend for social welfare?

Obviously, the basic problems posed by the hard facts have not been altered. Over 95 percent of those on our welfare rolls, and many, many others below the poverty level but so far unidentified to us, will remain outside the labor force, irrespective of the best efforts of industry in job development and job training or the stout insistence of recipients on adequate housing and equal job opportunity. The great mass of these people will continue to be the aged, the disabled, and children and those adults who must care for them. The unemployed employables by the most liberal definitions will comprise but a very small portion of the total.

We must not slacken our efforts to find work for these people and we must expand our educational and training programs for their benefit. But, I submit, all the ingenuity and resources of our new allies will not alter the simple fact that the great majority of these people will never share in the production of goods or services in our economy. Talk as we may about full employment, or employer of last resort, or work-relief projects, honesty compels us to concede that the vast majority of these people will never find employment.

The solution, in my opinion, lies in a fundamental reordering of our value system, an enormous task to which "We, the People" in the most inclusive sense must address ourselves.

Support for some form of income maintenance now comes from both the industrial community and the organized welfare recipients. Arjay Miller, then president and now vice-chairman of the board of the Ford Motor Company, announced his support of a negative income tax at a National Industrial Conference Board meeting in January. The Steering Committee that met following the Arden House Conference moved in the same direction. The May Forum of the Committee for Economic Development gave further impetus to the idea. We have yet to hear from the Heineman Committee and the National Industrial Conference Board.

The support of the organized welfare recipients for this idea needs no documentation.

What we are speaking of here is a more efficient, possibly more substantial system for the delivery of basic economic support both to those now on welfare and (with a new concern) to the remaining 22.5 million who live below the national poverty level. However, I would have much greater confidence in the capacity of our economists to evolve an appropriate system and in the strength of our economy to provide the financial resources for an income-maintenance program than I would in the readiness of our society to accept and support such a system.

I have listened to the voices of the welfare recipients. They are saying that their cash assistance should be increased, and an income-maintenance plan could and perhaps would do that. But what they are also saying, and with a deeper fervor, is that they want to be treated as people, with dignity, not as second-class citizens. They plead most eloquently their deep longing for a sense of pride, of self-respect, of individual worthiness. And they cite most persuasively the destructive influence on the younger generation as well as on themselves of the absence of these values in the present welfare system. They strike out at that system as demeaning, violative of privacy, replete with disincentives, corrosive of family life.

More money, more regularly distributed, will not necessarily alter this aspect of their situation in the least. We are still talking only of dollars. Indeed, an income-maintenance scheme may revive more vividly all the connotations and overtones of the dole,

splitting our society into two camps: those who pay taxes and those who get handouts.

If further proof be needed to make it clear that the fundamental issue is truly one of value judgments rather than of dollars, let me remind you of the somewhat obscured but broadly approved maze of income-support programs for the middle and upper classes. I refer, of course, to such measures as price-parity supports for farm products and other commodities; the staggering educational subsidies under the G. I. Bill of Rights; the various research grants programs; the extensive Federal Housing Administration and Veterans Administration home-loan programs; the enormous subsidies to transportation, especially to the air lines; and, of course, the variety of special benefits conferred under our tax laws. In the last category consider, for instance, the economic support implicit in the tax-exempt status conferred on charitable, educational, and religious organizations; in the deduction for interest paid on mortgage loans (in effect, an immense rent-supplement program for the middle and upper classes); in the deduction for business expenses, including those for properly related entertainment (said by some to spawn an "expense society"); in the unconscionably favored treatment accorded the oil industry. Or, in a slightly different sense, note that the \$600 exemption for each dependent is now in one aspect a children's allowance, perversely designed to benefit most those with the largest incomes and to be of no help to those whose incomes are below the taxable brackets.

The dollar flow from the public treasury under these programs is many, many times in excess of the amounts spent on public welfare. But these special-purpose welfare programs are found generally acceptable. All these programs respect our traditional sense of individualism, of reward for private diligence and industry. In sum, they are all premised on the Protestant work ethic. Certainly no stigma attaches to those who receive these benefits, and there is no suggestion of moral disapproval of aggressive applicants. Our value system condones these particular handouts of tax dollars.

In striking out for new approaches we have been focusing al-

most exclusively on the economic aspects of our national problem of dependency. We have not really given much thought to our human value system, or to what an income-maintenance system might be expected to do to people, to their spirit and morale. And I refer to the spirit and morale of those who contribute as well as of those who receive.

In my view, this situation calls for a rethinking of the value system of our society. Will we forever be limited exclusively by this so-called "Protestant work ethic," insisting that the badge of acceptability for any member of our society be his job? Will we always hold that anyone who does not contribute to our classical productive economy is of a lower order of humanity?

Welfare recipients and the others below the poverty level quite aside, what is to be the future of our increasing population over sixty-five? Where and how are they to continue to find essential meaning in life?

What if we are confronted with the blessings of a significant medical breakthrough in curing cancer or heart disease?

What, too, of most of the youth of our country, between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one, for whom there can now be no really meaningful work experience? Buffeted by the educational demands laid on them and battered by the draft, they are effectively barred from the labor market by minimum wage scales and exclusionary labor union practices.

Or, on the other hand, will we be willing to rethink our value system, to consider again, and most seriously, the whole doctrine of man and the ultimate basis of his individual worthiness?

May the day not have come for a substantial adaptation of the work ethic, for a recognition of its limitations, and the evolution of other sound value measurements?

The prospect of any such revision is genuinely disturbing, it threatens all our traditional formulations of individual worth. But ours is truly a new day. Man for the first time in the middle of this century has achieved the Biblical purpose for which he was placed upon the earth: "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing

that moveth upon the earth." The explosions of scientific knowledge and achievement have been such that it may now be said that the earth has indeed been subdued and in this sense man has established his dominion over it.

I suggest again that the economists and the innovators of our scientific technology have far outstripped our philosophers and our theologians. Why have organized religion and its individual leaders really only recently turned to these challenges? As Bishop Fulton J. Sheen says: "The church must be where the problems are, where the hunger is, where the rooms are cold, and where difficult decisions have to be made." Perhaps even more indignantly we can ask why our educational institutions and their personnel have not been hard at work on these problems, equipped as they are with great capacity for objective intellectual inquiry and articulate expression, unfettered by the limitations sometimes imposed by the orthodoxies of institutional religion. Why indeed have *we* not been thinking and acting? How much longer can we wait?

The resolution of these issues cannot be left to any group of experts however individually competent, or to any single segment of our society however powerful. Nor can one suggest any single technique, or any cluster of techniques, guaranteed to capture these problems or to produce their solutions. Methods and procedures will suggest themselves; others will emerge on further thought.

The situation calls for confident open-mindedness, fresh insight, courageous innovation, and a selfless readiness to step out boldly in new directions. These characteristics our people have demonstrated before—and will again. The call is clear for all of us: "We, the People," must act!

Business and Welfare: Coalition for Social Advancement

by KENT MATHEWSON

FOR TOO MANY YEARS, business and social welfare have behaved like a pair of caged cougars, pacing nervously about, eyeing each other with suspicion, occasionally snarling at one another—forced to share the same world, but doing so at best unwillingly.

During that time, the hardheaded men of business saw the world of social workers as one filled with “bleeding-heart do-gooders” bent on pampering an ever-widening sea of hands and mouths, reaching up for dole. At the same time, the social work profession too often viewed the business world as a collection of grim-visaged, nickel-nursing tightwads, cast in the perpetual mold of Dickens’s Scrooge.

Neither picture was an accurate one, of course. However, the inaccurate view held by each group produced a great gulf between the two worlds, bridged only by harsh and angry words on occasion.

That grim situation has changed, is continuing to change, and holds promise of even more meaningful change in the months and years ahead. We have seen the transformation of suspicious coexistence into the tentative beginnings of mutual concern, cooperation, and partnership—partnership for progress between the hardheaded world of business and the concerned world of social welfare.

It would be nice if we could look back and see that the beginnings of such an alliance were built on a positive evolution, for the common good of all concerned. Such is not the case, of course. Rather, we must look back on several years of urban

crisis, several long, hot summers of confrontation and violence. We must look back to that sort of negative impetus as the world of contemporary reality from which the alliance was born.

Each summer during the past few years has produced a series of ghetto incidents—some minor, many of major proportions. In the early years, each incident produced some reaction from the businessmen in the community, individual reactions by individual men in individual communities. In Detroit we watched with bemused amazement as those racial troubles flared across the nation. We “knew” that Detroit would never have “that sort of trouble.” After all, the reasoning went, we are doing all that can be done. We are helping the poor people, we have provided for our Negro population, we have set our house in order.

We soon found that we were deluding ourselves. We discovered that bitter truth in the midst of a riot that would eventually become the biggest in this nation’s history. We saw forty-three citizens die, several hundred left homeless, more than \$50 million of property damage, the closing of Detroit’s downtown business district for two days, the imposition of a three-county curfew for several days.

While the smoke still hung in the air, while Army troops wearily decamped, while a city poked its head out the door to stare in disbelief at the destruction—while that was happening, the world of business and industry opened its eyes too. Where individual effort had been the previously accepted reaction to riots and civil disorder, the businessmen of Detroit, and of the nation, decided finally to move together, to address themselves to the urban crisis in concert. In Detroit that movement took the form of a citizen resource committee called the New Detroit Committee, headed by Joseph L. Hudson, Jr., thirty-six-year-old head of the world’s second largest department store. On the national scene, it meant the formation of the Urban Coalition.

Formation of the Urban Coalition signaled the beginning of a new era. It marked a change in attitude within the world of business and industry, a change that I suspect many social workers had looked for in vain, for many years. Charles B. McCoy, president of the DuPont Company, put it this way:

[Business] must be part of the solution of [urban problems], not by words alone, but by deeds. . . . [Companies] . . . have a great deal to gain by the improvement of urban life, and a great deal to lose if community problems go unsolved. . . . Society cannot do without business, but neither can business survive and prosper unless its people are sensitive to the needs of society.¹

I believe that is typical of an attitude that is becoming the rule rather than the exception in the hardheaded world of business and industry. It is not totally new, of course. Through the years, many outstanding businessmen have recognized their social responsibilities and stood up to them—many, but not nearly enough. Of course, recognition of social responsibilities and realities by businessmen means that they are finally seeing life through the same glasses that social workers have used for years, and I certainly do not mean the rose-colored variety.

Thus, we have begun to move along that path to partnership, started to take the trip to a better world, side by side. The first way station on that journey is called "understanding." The businessman must understand social workers, and they, in turn, must understand the businessman. It is important to remember, for instance, that a business is basically a producer and seller of goods or services, and that as DuPont's McCoy points out: "Unless we [businessmen] do that well, and with a profit, there can be no further contribution to the community of any kind."²

While that should be fairly obvious, many critics of business seem to be unaware of it sometimes. After all, unless any business retains a strong economic base, it will have no jobs to offer, no payroll to put into the community, no ability to pay taxes to support public services; in short, no way to survive and thus to contribute to the solutions we all seek.

On the other hand, it is just as important that the businessman understand the necessary role of the social welfare community in this new alliance. I took part in the creation of the New Detroit Committee and continue to serve as coordinator of that committee and its staff. In that position I have seen new levels of un-

¹ Charles B. McCoy, "Business and the Community," Governor's Conference on Business and Industry, 1968, p. 3.

² *Ibid.*, p. 4.

derstanding of social work's role among the businessmen on the committee, and, to be honest, within myself.

What has appeared, I think, is a new perspective on just what the purpose of social welfare is as opposed to what many businessmen have long thought it was, or should be. Previously, the businessman, who is usually a man who has clawed his way up a corporate ladder or out of a little one-man shop, had looked upon the welfare world as one in which opportunity existed in abundance. The fault, he believed, lay with the individual welfare recipient who refused to take advantage of the opportunity. After all, the businessman reasoned, "I did it by myself. Why can't they?"

I need not pull apart the inconsistencies of that belief. Rather, let me go on to the picture as most businessmen have begun to see it—a picture of scant opportunity, and much of that held just beyond the individual's reach and grasp. It has begun to dawn on business that there are, in fact, forces surrounding that individual which preclude his "doing it by himself" in the grand old American tradition.

My business world is beginning to realize that social workers are not "bleeding-heart do-gooders." We are beginning to see them in the role of change agents, creators of opportunity for the client. In short, we are beginning to understand that side of the coin as we hope social work is beginning to understand ours.

Where does the path lie from here? What does the partnership hold in store for each of us?

To oversimplify, business can offer money, people, and knowledge and combinations thereof. There is, of course, investment money, like the billion-dollar fund pledged by the insurance business for investment specifically within the inner cities and ghettos of our nation. Certainly, business can and will provide investment monies for both short- and long-range projects and programs. Moreover, business stands ready to provide much of that money under far less stringent economic guidelines than have existed heretofore.

Then, too, money is granted outright to revitalize our urban centers. Our New Detroit Committee is currently winding up the

collection of \$10 million to set up a project "bank" as the first step in providing what we estimate will be a needed \$26 million investment in the Detroit region by Detroit business, industry, and labor. That total, I would point out, is in addition to the \$29 million raised annually for Detroit's United Foundation from many of those same business, industrial, and labor organizations. Parenthetically, we in Detroit are particularly proud of the fact that the concept of "give once for all" in the United Foundation originated in Detroit.

There are other ways in which business can and will contribute financially. But we think there are far greater values in this partnership than just dollars. There is manpower. Every business is built on people, on men and women trained in the use of management skills to help build that company's own operation. In the past, many companies have made it a point to urge management personnel to become involved with their communities by serving on boards of social agencies or working with community service organizations like the Jaycees or Kiwanis or the League of Women Voters. That was a good and sufficient answer in the old days. Not any more.

When we established the New Detroit Committee it had thirty-nine members. That membership included the heads of all three major automotive companies, the head of the United Auto Workers, the presidents of three utilities, the presidents of two universities—in short, key members of the city's business, industrial, and labor establishments. It also included inner city representatives, grass roots workers, and black militants, giving us a full spectrum of thought of and about Detroit, from top to bottom, black and white, rich and poor, city and suburb.

This diversified committee has built a solid base for communication and understanding. However, such a committee could not devote anything resembling full time to the critical problem of seeking reasons for the riots or to solutions to the problems uncovered. So, chairman Joseph L. Hudson, Jr., drafted a staff—literally drafted them. He called on the business, labor, and industry leaders on the committee to send him a staff to do the daily work. He was explicit in his request: "Send me men you

cannot spare," he told them; "anyone you can spare won't be able to handle the job."

And send them they did. Within a week, thirty-five top-level management people had joined our task force, assigned to devote full time, and often overtime, to the New Detroit operation. That first crew was promised for three months, and stayed five. Our second task force of volunteers is just finishing its stint, and we are rounding up a third to carry on the work.

That infusion of talent has signaled an exciting new level of participation by business. First of all, our staff work has been of the highest caliber because our volunteer workers have been of the highest caliber. They have brought to bear on our vast problems a wealth of expertise and knowledge—and all the while they were being paid by their own companies.

As the first wave of task force people prepared to wind up their tour of duty, we saw a bright residual benefit to this scheme of volunteer staff members. Each man and woman took back to his company an entirely new insight into the problem of this urban crisis. Many of the companies have utilized these people to spread the word throughout their organizational structures at branch plants and offices elsewhere in Michigan and, in some cases, across the nation.

As each task force group phases out, we are building a cadre of personnel spread across the business community of Detroit, middle- and upper-management men who will carry that new insight and concern with them as they move up the ladder. Those men have become a very real investment in the future, a solid foundation on which this work will continue for many years.

In a speech to the Detroit Jaycees, Robinson Barker, board chairman of PPG Industries, suggested that business return to the days of the Second World War's "dollar-a-year-man" concept. He outlined a plan, since implemented in Pittsburgh by PPG Industries, for offering management people the opportunity to spend one year working with a social agency while still on the company payroll. He too sees the dual benefits of what that staff man can offer to the agency and, just as importantly, what he will bring back to the job in terms of social concern and recognition of the realities of our contemporary world.

Another possibility for personnel involvement lies in a program pioneered in Detroit by the Michigan Bell Telephone Company, that of "adopting" an inner city school. Under the plan, since entered into by several other companies in Detroit, company personnel spend part of their work day or week in the school, teaching and counseling. The help offered runs the gamut from demonstrating proper job interview procedures and dress to training in switchboard work and telephone installing.

Again the involvement is a two-way experience. Not only does the student benefit from the extra help, the employee also gains new insight into problems he probably never realized even existed.

A final level at which business can contribute meaningfully to the partnership is through the application of knowledge and expertise. Business is the process of analyzing a problem, finding a solution, and then delivering that solution to the proper place. Armies of men and women toil millions and millions of man hours daily on that simple equation. It is time for some of that brainpower to be applied to the pressing urban and social needs of this day.

It is time, for instance, that business enters into an alliance with the social welfare world to restructure the welfare system. Social workers are not happy with the present system; the client is not happy with it; and certainly the businessman is not happy with it.

It is time that those skills devoted to making profits be made available to cooperate with the social work profession in finding a new way. Certainly, businessmen would be unwilling to let a system continue to function in the wheezing fashion that our welfare system has for these many years.

In Detroit, poverty chief Dick Simmons has been working with the business management firm of Touche, Ross, Bailey, and Smart to explore the feasibility of utilizing computers and data-processing techniques to improve the welfare service within our city. Preliminary indications are that the marriage of computers and welfare has proved to be a most promising alliance.

What we might consider astounding about it all is that it took this long to reach that point of sophistication. The welfare system

has been here a long time; data processing has been around a few years, too. We hope this newly founded partnership will open many new doors to sophisticated problem-analysis and -solving.

The challenge to the profession of social work now lies in matching that thrust, in delineating ways in which those contributions can be most meaningful. We were especially careful in organizing the New Detroit Committee to include representatives of the grass roots and of social agencies. The realization acquired in the past few years made it apparent to Joseph Hudson that it would be necessary to listen very carefully to the grass roots before the so-called "establishment" could react intelligently. It is just as vital that social workers provide some guidance and direction so that the money and manpower and knowledge are not spent uselessly or in meaningless fashion.

My concern for a partnership in this struggle is based on the belief that each force can and will work to its full potential and that in doing so the total result will become greater than the parts. At the same time, I fully recognize a grave danger which must be avoided. That danger lies, I feel, in the possible creation of a monopoly on reform, the creation of some superagency to control all reform in a community. Establishment of a form of Urban Coalition within any community makes such a monopoly at the very least a possibility.

In such a circumstance, the coalition effort *could* become the single agency that passes judgment on projects, proposals, and programs. Such singlehanded direction could effectively stifle meaningful programs while negating significant outside thought and manpower. The New Detroit Coalition Committee has pointedly avoided such a role in the community. It has been the committee's credo throughout that we would be a "causer of good deeds rather than a doer of good deeds." We have aggressively prodded the rest of the community to do its share, to step up to the responsibility.

The religious community in Detroit has made giant contributions over the past few months, and each of the many programs initiated by our church leaders has been conducted on a basis of total autonomy. Although in some cases the program has re-

quested endorsement and/or partial funding from the New Detroit operation, it was made clear that the program would go on, with or without our committee's involvement.

We believe that such pluralistic reform is not only good but necessary. No one on the New Detroit Committee or its staff thinks for one moment that we have cornered the market on logic, concern, or social reform. Quite the opposite: we seek outside ideas and effort; we support fully the concept of self-determination.

The concept of self-determination is a key phrase in Detroit. The black community of Detroit has made significant strides in the past several months in this area, battling strongly on many fronts to be represented within the decision-making process. And an intrinsic part of the committee's original planning was the inclusion of voices from throughout the community on the committee itself.

The committee sees its role as one of coordination of the revitalization of Detroit rather than of monopolistic control. Certainly some coordination is necessary; if nothing else, it serves to avoid duplication. Many times in the past few months we have become aware that two separate agencies were about to embark on similar programs and we introduced them to one another for a common good. The committee has often acted as a virtual clearinghouse for programs and projects and it has resisted the idea that securing its stamp of approval was the only road to success.

Our committee recently published a progress report, a lengthy analysis of what should be done to eradicate the conditions which spawned the Detroit riots. That report makes sixty-four categorical proposals for future action by sixteen outside organizations. So, we think that the danger of monopolistic control of the reform process is successfully being avoided in Detroit. But it is a clear danger and should be guarded against in this new coalition of effort springing up about the country.

Some thought should be given to the brand-new relationships that will be created. Those relationships exist in two ways, which I visualize as "horizontal" and "vertical."

In the context of what I call new "horizontal" realities, we see people who have operated at the same level previously, undergoing some new experiences in their relationships. Late last summer, for example, we saw Henry Ford II and Walter Reuther together in New Detroit Committee meetings, working shoulder to shoulder, while several miles away negotiation teams from Ford and the UAW worked around the clock to settle a nationwide strike.

One committee has worked hard on the problems of consumer credit and on the possibilities for inner city retail cooperative ventures. That committee includes the presidents of the city's largest department store, the region's largest women's apparel chain, and the city's largest independent supermarket chain. We have seen, too, the presidents of our two major universities working together in the hope of organizing county community college programs. The past nine months have seen many such new relationships between persons whose previous contacts had been more formal than functional.

At the same time, entirely new vertical relationships have been established between persons with absolutely no prior contact, formal, informal, functional, or otherwise. Each committee meeting and many staff meetings have engendered a growing rapport between members of the so-called "establishment" and the members of the grass roots community.

At one early meeting, an avowed militant stood up, pointed dramatically at the president of one of the major auto companies, and said, "If you don't listen to us, your factories will be the next to go." Today, they listen to each other, they learn from each other, they have an informal sort of partnership like the one I am urging now.

We have seen the president of a major utility company and the chairman of the local NAACP join forces to threaten legal action over discrimination in the hiring practices and apprentice program of the city's skilled trade unions. And the secretary of the union is a fellow member of the New Detroit Committee.

Each meeting sees the equality of voice and vote of the director

of our United Community Services Organization with the head of a group of AFDC mothers. The two sides of our welfare world never have met under such circumstances before.

I urge all members of the social work profession to join hands with the businessmen in their individual communities. Those businessmen are ready, after these many years, ready, willing, and very, very able. They have a great deal to offer: manpower, knowledge, and money. Social work has as much to offer them: insight and what the businessman would call "input."

It will not all be a fun-filled stroll. It will probably be very hard at the beginning, in fact. There will be a language barrier. Both will need to learn a whole new jargon. Each will need to do some homework to learn about the realities of the other's world. But the objective is worth it all; for the rainbow at path's end is one of great hope for a great nation.

Again I quote DuPont's McCoy: "Society cannot do without business, but neither can business survive and prosper unless its people are sensitive to the needs of society."

Author's Note

Formed as a citizens' resource effort following the Detroit riot of 1967, the New Detroit Committee was charged with responsibility for the physical and social revitalization of Detroit. Although it was convened by joint order of Governor George Romney and Mayor Jerome Cavanagh, the Committee does not have official relationship to either the state or the city government. Thus, it does have autonomy and is free to choose its own goals, set its own priorities.

To accomplish its general aims, the Committee divided itself into eight subcommittees to deal with specific areas of concern and raised \$10 million to provide "seed money" to assist in stimulating committee objectives. These subcommittees include:

1. *Law*: primarily dealing with legal circumstances of the poor; helped research and write model fair housing and tenants' rights laws for the state legislature
2. *Housing*: working in areas of construction and renovation of low-income housing; aiding some existing efforts; and supporting the creation of projects originating in the community
3. *Youth, Recreation, Cultural Affairs*: designed a massive summer

program for youth, which was incorporated into the over-all city plan; working on special projects for disadvantaged youth in both recreation and cultural affairs

4. *Economic Development*: working with businessmen who would like to, or be willing to, locate new plants or offices in the inner city; assisting efforts of Negro groups to form self-contained development organizations; initiated an economic development corporation to deal directly with the problem outside committee structure

5. *Communications*: working primarily with need for flow of information and communication to all-white city and suburban areas about their stake in the inner city crisis; publishing newsletter; running a volunteer speakers' bureau; working with mass media directly and also via some outside organizational projects funded, in part, by the New Detroit Committee

6. *Community Services*: addressing itself to the high priority of police/community relations, including funding of an extensive review of the city's police department by an outside agency; working directly with grass-roots organizations in supporting existing projects; studying service delivery effort of United Community Service, the city's private welfare coordinating agency

7. *Education*: working primarily with inner-city schools to upgrade weak spots in the school system; granted funds to system for several summer and school year projects, including summer school tuition project and a textbook project designed to make certain that every sixth-grade student has his own textbook (currently, ratio is one book per two students)

8. *Employment*: has had notable success in moving local organizations to review hiring standards and practices which may needlessly screen out so-called "hard core unemployed"; instrumental in revision of police department hiring procedures; working with the Board of Commerce in securing jobs (more than 50,000 new jobs since last August) and also in job upgrading of minority group workers

The Committee as a whole meets monthly to take action on subcommittee recommendations for funding and/or endorsement support of projects; has taken over-all stands for fair housing at the state level, stronger gun controls at the federal level; supported fair housing and two flying trips to the state capitol en masse to support the bill directly with members of the legislature

Labor's Views on Social Priorities

by LEO PERLIS

ONE DOES NOT NEED TO BE an expert to know what is troubling our country, and one does not need to be a specialist to know what has to be done about it. As a matter of fact, it helps if one is *not*, for there is no single solution to our many problems.

Anyone with eyes to see knows that we are living in troubled times, and to say that other peoples in other times were troubled too does little to relieve our own anxiety.

Arnold Toynbee took pains to remind us that twenty-one civilizations perished—nineteen of them through self-destruction. This is not to suggest that our society is on the verge of collapse. We are much too young, resourceful, and flexible for sudden extinction. It does serve to warn us that we do have something to worry about.

We are the wealthiest nation on the face of the earth. And yet more than 30 million of our people live in poverty.

We are the mightiest nation on the face of the earth, with highly skilled men and sophisticated weapons at our command. And yet we are not winning the war in Vietnam.

We are the most permissive nation on the face of the earth, where liberty is merging into license and where everything is "go-go" or "go." And yet our doors are closed to more than 20 million people because of the color of their skin.

We are the most generous nation on the face of the earth, sharing billions of our wealth, over the years, with millions less fortunate than we through the Marshall Plan, UNRRA, United Nations, CARE, and a variety of voluntary, governmental, and intergovernmental agencies. And yet nobody seems to love us.

We spend more money on medical research than any other nation in the world. And yet the rate of infant mortality is lower in

twelve other countries, including Japan, Czechoslovakia, and the United Kingdom.

But this paradox of plenty is a tale twice told. We must see in it our promise as well as our problem.

Yes, we have poverty and frustration, disease and discrimination, enemies and hippies. We have also wealth and power, freedom and skill, responsibility, flexibility, and hope.

If our society were at a standstill, there would be no hope. But ours is a forward-moving society.

One third of our people lived in poverty thirty years ago as against one seventh today. In 1959 there were 38.9 million poor people. By the end of 1966 the number had fallen to 29.7 million.

In 1930 there were only 46,000 scientists in the entire country. By 1963 the number had increased nearly ninefold, to 410,000.

Our society is more open today than it was fifteen years ago. Our schools are more open now, and our hotels and homes and shops and stores and city halls are more open now. There are Negro mayors in Cleveland, in Gary, in Washington, and in Montclair. There is Justice Marshall on the Supreme Court, and Secretary Weaver in the President's Cabinet. Some day, I hope, it may not be necessary to point to these men as symbolic of their race, as it is no longer necessary to point to Senators McCarthy and Kennedy as Catholic or to Senator Javits as Jewish.

Our people, on the whole, are healthier today than they were at the beginning of the Second World War, and many diseases, including polio, diabetes, tuberculosis, syphilis, and even the flu, have been practically eliminated, substantially reduced, or controlled.

Our country may not be loved around the world, but, more important, we have allies whose own national interests and concern for a free, flexible, just, and peaceful society of nations coincide with ours.

If I sound like an optimist, it is because I am one. And I am an optimist partly because I think I know America.

If I had to make a choice, I would rather join with those who engage in the politics of joy and happiness than in the politics of sackcloth and ashes. I would want all Americans to share in

the joy and happiness of a bountiful society, free, mighty, wealthy, healthy, flexible, and open.

This is the promise of America. This is the American dream. And this is the America I love because it is my promised land. Here I speak as I please. Here I worship as I please.

I love America because I have a stake in it, and my children have a stake in it. It is my America, it is their America, but it is not yet the America of many millions of black men, red men, poor men.

Do they have a stake in it? Do they love it? The answers, my friends, are written in blood and fire from Watts to Washington.

Is it rebellion? Of course it is.

Is it arson and looting and murder? Of course it is.

Is it crime on our streets? Of course it is.

But we cannot afford to wallow in self-righteous luxury by simply blaming it all on black punks instead of white prejudice, on a radical and revolutionary minority instead of a know-nothing, do-nothing, and postpone-everything majority.

Yes, it is more than rebellion and arson and looting and murder. It is a warning that America must be shared, that America's wealth and health and promise must be shared with the dispossessed and the disinherited. The warning is shrill and shocking, but is it less shocking that 30 million of our people live in poverty? Is it less shocking that within the last decade the Negro infant mortality rate in Mississippi's Bolivar County has increased 25 percent while the white rate has declined 33 percent? Is it less shocking that more than 20 million people have been estranged, in one way or another, from their fellow citizens for more than 300 years?

The facts and the figures of poverty and discrimination are not new to any of us. We have heard and seen them before. But have we learned from them? Have we really learned?

This, after all, must be the first priority for social change—the learning, the understanding, the feeling, and, finally, our changing.

We shall never learn unless we know what it means to be unequal in the land of equality.

We shall never understand unless we know what it means to be poor in the land of affluence.

We shall never feel unless we know what it means to be hopeless in the land of promise.

Those of us who have experienced days of hunger through no fault of our own and years of wrath at the hands of neighbors because of our color or race or religion will recognize the face of poverty and prejudice.

I have a long memory and I find it easy to react against those who counsel patience. How long is patience? Are 300 years patience? Is a lifetime patience? The counsel of patience is justified only if we have a goal, work hard to reach it, and can see the light at the end of the tunnel.

Yes, we have a forward-moving society, but we must move it forward much faster.

The forces shaping our world are moving at such a rapid pace, multiple revolutions are converging upon us all at once and at such an accelerated rate, that we hardly have time to understand their implications and to absorb their impact.

The real question is: Are we ready for a new day? A sudden new day of space and sex and science and knowledge and politics and economics and international, interpersonal, and racial relations and realignments?

It is obvious from Berkeley to Columbia, from Dallas and Memphis and ninety cities and towns across the land, that we are not quite ready. It is obvious from the conflicts at home between young and old, black and white, rich and poor, that we are not quite ready.

It is obvious from Paris and Prague and Warsaw and Madrid that other nations are not quite ready.

Perhaps all these conflicts, dissensions, and frustrations are unavoidable in a time of great change and overwhelming power, but how we and our institutions come through when the dust finally settles will determine the quality of our lives for many generations to come. It all depends on what we do now and how we do it.

If we follow the old and young manipulators of the extreme

Left whose heroes are Ho, Castro, and Mao, then we shall go down the road to Stalin's version of America or, perhaps, to an American version of a new Communist orthodoxy.

On the other hand, if we follow the manipulators of the extreme Right whose pantheon includes Hitler in various shapes, forms, and postures, then we shall go down the road to a totalitarian America or, perhaps, to an American version of Fascism.

This polarization between Left and Right causes reactions from left and right at the expense of the great middle. It may no longer be fashionable to suggest it, but the only answer to extremist minorities is a consensus of the majority committed to reform and reconciliation.

What are the alternatives to consensus? First chaos, then anarchy, and, finally, totalitarianism of the Right or the Left—more likely the Right—after all, there are only five roads that we can travel:

1. We can retain our society as it is with all its imperfections, with all its slums, discrimination, disease, unemployment, and assorted evils, simply because some believe that this is the perfect society. This is the position of the sultans of the *status quo*.

2. We can return our society to an earlier, dreamier day, a day of slavery, a day without unions, a day of high profits and low taxes for some, and low wages and long hours for others. This is the sense of the medieval mind.

3. We can resign from our society because it is shot full of false values and hypocrisy and there is little hope for it. This is the razor-sharp point of view of the conscious hippie and the fuzzy philosophy of those who escape from reality into a hazy world of alcoholism, LSD, daydreams, and nightmares.

4. We can revolt against our society, overthrow it, and establish another society, a society designed to meet the particular neurotic or psychotic needs of the extremists on the left or the extremists on the right. This is the position of the revolutionary perfectionist.

5. We can reform our imperfect society, constituted, as it is, of imperfect human beings and their imperfect institutions. We can reform because ours is a society of opportunities and pos-

sibilities, flexibility and fluidity. This is the point of view of the realist-idealist.

It is good to remind ourselves once in a while, and particularly in troubled times, that our options are limited to five roads: retain it, return it, resign from it, rebel against it, or reform it. The road we take will determine not only what goals we reach, but how we get there and what tolls we pay.

As for me, I shall take the road of reform and reconciliation. I have had enough of the good old days of high profits for "them" and low wages for "us." I shall not put up the barricades and exchange an open, flexible, and democratic albeit imperfect society for a closed society of one-man or one-party rule.

I shall not be satisfied with what we have so long as one man is estranged because of the color of his skin, so long as one child does not have enough to eat, so long as our air and water are polluted, so long as our cities and towns are permitted to sprawl in ugliness and disrepair, so long as the quality of life is allowed to give way to the quantity of life, so long as man is lost in the mass.

What else can we do except go down the road to reform and reconciliation more rapidly than ever before if we are to catch up and meet head-on all the challenges of all the revolutions that have been converging upon us at the same time—the knowledge explosion, the population explosion, automation, the new morality, urbanization, alienation?

To reform our society as rapidly as we can without shaking it to its very foundations we need: (a) purpose; (b) will; (c) imagination; (d) skills; (e) resources; (f) manpower; and (g) money. We seem to have everything except the will. But without the will, the manpower, the skills, the imagination, and the money will lie fallow and our purpose will not be achieved.

The national purpose of our society, or of any society, for that matter, is wrapped up in two words: "participation" and "poverty"—the promotion and extension of participation and the prevention and elimination of poverty.

In 1968 there is only one question before America: do we have the will to reform our society peacefully and pay for it by eliminating poverty and by promoting participation?

I have gone quite a long way without using the words "relevant," "confrontation," or "dialogue." I am sick of them for many reasons, largely because they are the current fashionable clichés, partly because they are often substitutes for thought and action, and partly because they have lost, in misuse and overuse, all meaning.

Despite all reference to dialogue, we talk less to each other now than ever before. Who has the time? And anyway, the fences are too high.

Despite all reference to confrontation, we look less often into each other's eyes now than ever before. Who has the time?

Despite all reference to relevance, man and his institutions have always been, for one reason or another, either up to their times, behind their times, or ahead of their times. Many a man who invokes the magic word "relevance" today is often a late convert to an idea proposed quietly and prematurely.

It was just as "relevant" for our people and their organizations to be against racial segregation and poverty a hundred years ago, or a thousand years ago, as it is today, and to formulate their policies and to develop their programs accordingly.

My list of priorities, therefore, is no more relevant today than it would have been, say, twenty years ago. High on my list is the need to divorce ourselves from the slogan for the day and the clichés of the past. We should not permit ourselves to be mesmerized into a thoughtless mobocracy, spouting "free enterprise," "welfare state," "black power," "socialized medicine," and too many other catch phrases whose true meaning is clear only to the intellectually inclined manipulators who used them in the first place for reasons which only they know but which we can all guess.

But the first order of business is to stop singing "Who's Afraid of the Big, Bad Welfare State?" Let us, instead, meet with one another instead of confronting one another. Let us, instead, talk to one another instead of engaging in formal dialogues. Let us, instead, do what is right and just and moral instead of what is only "relevant," and, by all means, let us treat, if we can, the neurotic and the psychotic extremists as emotionally disturbed people who deserve our concern and care rather than our head-

lines and platforms. By all means let us not give them ground for exploitation and reason for manipulation. If we do, then we shall not only have extremism, we shall deserve it.

High on my priority list is an open-door policy for every human being. Too many of our institutions are still too closed. Too many of our agencies have their favorite Jew, their favorite Negro, their favorite labor leader—the symbolic Jew, the symbolic Negro, the symbolic labor leader. When I say an open-door policy, that is exactly what I mean—without reservations, qualifications, or rationalizations. “Let them prove themselves,” we say to the Negroes, but we never gave them the opportunity to prove themselves. “Let them be elected,” we say, but we stopped them from being nominated. “Let them pull themselves up by their own bootstraps,” but we took away their boots and sometimes even their legs. “Let them get an education,” we say, but we kept them out of our schools.

We can all make contributions to our community and country if we are given a chance and are cultivated as thoroughly as the up-and-coming agency executive cultivates the “best” people and the people with money and power.

Yes, black is beautiful and so are white and red and yellow, and so are Jew and Catholic and Protestant. When we can see this beauty, and only then, will America be beautiful.

Open housing, open schools, open hospitals, open hotels, open agencies, open unions, open colleges—*everything* must be open to black as well as to white, to poor as well as to rich. This is what we mean by participation—democratic participation by labor in industry, by students and faculties in universities, by workers and clients in agencies, by all citizens in their government and in the total political, economic, social, and cultural life of their community and country. And if new legislation and more education are needed to achieve a truly open society, then let us educate and let us legislate over and over again, but let us never equivocate.

I place so much emphasis on the need for changing our attitudes because unless we do, our will and our money will not be released, and we shall meet once again to recite the old litany

of horrors (slums, poverty, discrimination) and the old list of priorities (jobs, education, housing).

The year 1968 is a good political year to make up our minds that we want action now, that we need and want a catch-up Congress in Washington and not just another do-nothing Congress or even a do-something Congress. We are so far behind that a do-something Congress will simply not do. Only a catch-up Congress can hope to complete the unfinished business of America in 1968. This business includes the need for creating one million public service jobs for the unemployed and underemployed. H.R. 12280 authorizes \$4 billion of federal grants to federal, state, and local government agencies and private nonprofit organizations for the creation of these jobs. Social workers can readily see that this measure, if enacted, will not only help relieve unemployment but will provide socially useful work and badly needed services.

Jobs, of course, are the key to our problem. Private business apparently cannot provide jobs for all. The government, therefore, must become an employer of last resort.

Still, through the National Alliance of Businessmen, the private sector has undertaken a major task of employing 500,000 hard-core unemployed. The will is there, the unemployed are there, and the work is there, but the problem is to keep the jobless from remaining unemployed. Here social work and social welfare can be of great value to labor and management, helping the hard-core unemployed to become productive workers and useful citizens, making the facilities, resources, and services of their agencies available to them, and in training union counselors who, on a one-to-one basis, will help their new fellow workers find their way in the plant, the union, the community, and the new life.

Even more jobs can be created if Congress will enact the President's essential ten-year program for erecting 6 million publicly assisted low- and moderate-income housing units as well as an expanding public works program to meet expanding national and community needs for schools, hospitals, day care centers, playgrounds and other recreation and leisure-time facilities, sewage systems, and water supplies.

High on the list of social priorities is the need for a system of federal aid to education which would permit any willing and qualified young man and young woman to obtain public education from kindergarten through college, with special educational and vocational training facilities for those who need, want, and are qualified for such special education and training. This should include experimental boarding schools for the poor in another national effort to break the cycle of dependency.

Our health as well as our education is a major national resource. The development and preservation of this resource require a comprehensive national health insurance system based on group practice through a network of hospital-based medical centers available to all and staffed by an expanding force of professionals and their aides, trained and equipped to care for the whole man from head to toe with emphasis on prevention. Voluntary health insurance schemes and Medicare have shown us the way. They can be integrated into a national program, but at present they are simply inadequate to the task of preserving our health.

One major item at the top of the agenda must be a higher minimum wage and the elimination of the so-called "right-to-work," anti-union laws. More people have been raised out of poverty by minimum wage legislation and collective bargaining than by the whole "war on poverty." The fact is that the war on poverty was never a war. It is no reflection on the dedicated directors and staff of the Office of Economic Opportunity to say that the war on poverty was long on promise and short on performance. The fault lies with Congress for not appropriating enough money. We simply cannot win a war on poverty on peanuts.

While the real war on poverty must be a total public-voluntary effort involving all governmental and private agencies, still it is highly essential that one single federal agency be fully financed and fully equipped to focus the attention of the country on the problem, to galvanize our efforts to solve it, to prod the government bureaucracy into moving forward faster, and to experiment in new areas and new directions.

While poverty is a rural and a reservation as well as an urban

problem, still the poor are linked more and more with the inner city. The inner city will not be saved unless the suburbs are opened up to all Americans and their residents are required to pay for using the resources and facilities of the city.

Urban blight and suburban flight are so thoroughly enmeshed in American middle-class values, prejudices, and morality that it is almost impossible to find rational solutions without coming to grips with greed, corruption, racism, and materialism. Here is also crime, and not only crime on the streets; it is a more insidious crime because it pollutes our air and our water, our lungs and our lives, with dangerous particles and unessential poisons—all for a bigger and faster profit.

I suspect that supplicating hands in prayer will not help here so much as the iron muscle of the law, enforcing building codes, fire codes, health codes, and the iron muscle of the conscience, enforcing moral codes, human codes, and survival codes.

I realize why many racists stress crime in our streets at the expense of civil rights, but for the life of me I cannot understand why some liberals blink at crime in the streets, are apologetic about it, or attempt to rationalize it. Crime in the streets is crime in the streets no matter who commits the crime.

The prevention of crime and the elimination of fear from our cities should be a high priority. Our cities need more and better paid police and more and better law enforcement resources and procedures. But above all, our country needs the shining example that can come only from those with money and power. If they cut corners, "get while the getting is good," the least we can do is to refuse to give them testimonial dinners and awards and board memberships.

High on the priority list, of course, is peace in Vietnam—not just any kind of temporary peace, but a peace that will protect nations from aggression. The war is costly, but we must decide whether isolating ourselves in Fortress America may not be more costly in the long run. Or have we forgotten Hungary, Korea, Tibet, not to say Poland and Czechoslovakia?

Americans may differ, but we cannot differ on the need for spending more money for our domestic priorities. I do not agree

with those who say that if we only got out of Vietnam we would have \$25 billion a year for home-front programs. The question is why did we not spend that much at home before Vietnam, and why do we not spend an additional \$25 billion now? We still have a gross national product of \$800 billion a year, and it is climbing even higher.

Of course, all this means that if we are at all serious about our social priorities we shall simply have to pay for them. To do it equitably would require revision of our tax laws, higher taxes, and the closing of all loopholes, such as the oil depletion allowance, through which those who can afford to pay more, usually escape.

Some of these tax funds must, of necessity, be earmarked to provide income maintenance above the poverty line, social services and human amenities to those millions who are now on public assistance rolls because they are too young, too old, or too disabled to work. But the public welfare program, messy and inefficient and unproductive as it is, is still a last resort against hunger and starvation and, therefore, the best face of our Judeo-Christian civilization. It should not be permitted to become again the political football of ambitious demagogues. Millions of public welfare recipients simply cannot work, and to speak of job training for them is sheer nonsense. Still, the whole system should be federalized into one single category, with federal standards, and it should be tied more closely to other systems of income maintenance, principally social insurance.

Without more jobs, more money, more health care, less pollution, more police, all talk of the quality of human life is just talk. There is no spirituality in poverty, and I have yet to see a hungry person clamoring for a pass to the symphony. There is no quality without quantity, but constant preoccupation with mere quantity often inhibits our society from becoming the truly great society which it can be.

Can a great society ever arise out of an organized society of organization men and women? I think not. It may be asking too much, but if our organized society wishes to become a great society it better encourage inner-directed organization men who

will not be "on the make" or "on the take" but who will risk being loners and will even stand up to the "main-chance boys" for the sake of human progress.

Now who is going to do all this? Why, we, of course—the people, through our democratic government, through our organizations, with our own minds, hands, and hearts. The task is too big for the lonely man in the White House. It is too big even for Congress. And it is certainly much too much for the New Left, which is really warmed-over Old Left.

If we do a good enough job, our young revolutionaries, black and white and mostly middle class, will have to find their romance outside revolution.

After all, as the Rev. William Killam wrote: "There are two kinds of fools in the world. The one says, 'This is old, therefore it is good,' and the second says, 'This is new, therefore it is better.'"

I do not think that we are fools, but I am sure that we are often forgetful. It is good to have our young rebels around to prod us, even if they do sometimes make a mess of things themselves, for which they should be made to pay the consequences—even as we do.

Advocacy and Urban Planning

by MARSHALL KAPLAN

TO DATE, THE CITY PLANNING PROFESSION and, therefore, most city planners have played a peripheral role in American urban life. Steeped in a philosophical tradition of logical positivism, planners have for the most part viewed their role as primarily that of applying the value system of others to a set of facts which they can aggregate, analyze, and (under guidance) forge into a set of alternative programs and strategies. This bifurcation of fact and value parallels the historical fears of the planning profession to "mix in politics." Indeed, one of the earliest institutions to evolve from the acceptance of planning as a city function was the planning commission. Its prime function, besides serving as collective salesman for the still embryonic profession, was to separate the planner from the "evil" influences of city hall.

The separation by fiat reflected in the insertion of the commission between technician and politician merely ratified the already accepted normative behavior pattern that technicians should, like mystics, receive values from the outside. Both the institution and the philosophy would have been enough to lessen the impact of the emerging profession. Unfortunately, however, a third millstone was added as a burden. In essence, city planning and the city planner were mesmerized by their concern, primarily with the physical environment, and their acceptance of a deterministic view of the importance of that environment. Paraphrasing Robert Frost, good neighborhoods make good people.

Unfortunately, planning came of age during an aseptic era in American city government. In effect, the combined influence of the New Deal and the local government reformer diminished the role of city hall as a broker of conflict, as a place where often-

times competing individual, group, and community interests could be resolved with a level of acrimony tolerable to all but the most sensitive white patrician. The New Deal, in elevating and formalizing the resource-allocation game, bypassed local government for the most part, and weakened the influence of the local politician. Similarly, the end of partisan local primaries, the termination of the ward system, the use of at-large municipal elections,¹ the increased number of independent commissions in many large cities, and the coming of age of the city manager system helped convert the role of the politician from that of broker to that of administrator.

The evolution of local governmental structure and process represented a victory of sorts for the new American middle class. Politics and poker were synonymous with the ethics of the "potato eater," the "kike," and the "wop." The "spade" and the "spic" had not yet achieved political visibility. Conversely, the "honest, impartial, and efficient pursuit of the interests of the community as a whole" was indicative of the emerging ethics of a white, middle-class, Protestant society. Indeed, as the American dream became converted into reality² for an increasingly large number of Americans, the immigrant became Protestantized, accepted the ethic and opted for a clean political system.

To the planner, this evolution in city government conformed to his predefined and accepted behavior pattern. Positivism became institutionalized by the ingathering of technicians at city hall, politics became sanitized by the city manager and civil service systems, and physical determinism became emphasized in the concern for making cities beautiful, efficient, and economical. Uncle Sam reduced the need for the city to be occupied with social welfare.

The primary tool of the planner, the general plan, was the complete image of the evolution. Rather than conflict and competing interests as a way of urban life, the general plan reflected consensus, and pejorative acceptance of a corporate or utilitarian

¹ "At-large elections" refer to the election of city councilmen by the entire city electorate rather than by specific neighborhoods or subcommittees.

² Whether we like that reality or not.

view of the city. Rather than recognize class and/or caste, the general plan usually perceived only infrastructure and enveloping land use. Rather than assuming priorities among and between functions and projects, priorities based on the strength of competing claims of competing groups, the general plan assumed complete rationality, comprehensibility, and an equality "possible" as an abstraction but denied in the real world.

Although such an approach can be described, it cannot be practiced except for relatively simple problems and even then only in a somewhat modified form. It assumes intellectual capacities and sources of information that men simply do not possess, and it is even more absurd as an approach to policy when the time and money that can be allocated to a policy problem is limited, as is always the case.³

For the most part, city planning and city planners have had only minimal impact on the decision-making processes. Originally, this lack of impact was blamed by the professional on the system. Academic tomes, as well as speeches at annual conventions of the American Institute of Planners, emphasized the fact that, while truth, beauty, and wisdom had been captured and internalized by the profession, "them outsiders" would not listen. Mayors, councilmen, and even city managers had somehow mistakenly neglected to follow the planners' essentially normative planning process and product, while their constituents often cruelly rejected or, worse, closed their ears to the planners' conventional wisdom about the physical environment.

Only recently has the profession turned inward, and turned introspective. The plain facts of life appear to be that long-range, multifunctional tools like the general plan are quite irrelevant to urban life. Because consensus can often be achieved in present-day, urban America by reducing goals or objectives to their lowest common denominator, most plans read like admonitions to God and Motherhood and, in most cases, God and Mother are white. Where a precise statement, either in the form of objective or proposal, is made, the long-range nature of that statement emphasizes its Alice-in-Wonderland quality and weakens its im-

³ Charles E. Lindblom, "The Science of 'Muddling Through,'" *Public Administration Review*, XIX (1959), 80.

pact or import. The comprehensiveness sought of the planner is denied by both intellectual limitations and the impossibility of the task itself.

Perhaps our inability and ineffectiveness in striving for the comprehensive have led to our need to be specific and precise about such mandated responsibilities as zoning and subdivision regulations, urban renewal, and capital improvement programs. Here again, our record has not been too successful. Here again, our response has been first to blame those bad guys on the outside. Market pressures personalized as those "evil speculators and land developers" have wreaked havoc on land-use controls and assisted in making urban renewal a perversion of objectives, while pressures of competing groups often reduce sheltered capital improvement programs and capital budgets to a shambles. Where these tools have had an impact, this impact has often been inimical to the interests of the least favored group—the urban poor. Indeed, with proper funding and a sabbatical from current pursuits, it would not be too difficult to prove that plans and planners have served through engagement in the planning process to redistribute local resources away from the have-nots to the haves.

Positivism, physical determinism, and political separation do not provide the planner with a working set of premises or guidelines commensurate with the realities of urban life. The advent of the war on poverty, now followed by the model cities program, indicates a changing set of national priorities and perspectives. Both offer opportunities to redefine the urban planning function and process.

Not only did the original Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) mandate recognize the "hidden" poverty in our central cities, it also recognized that community interests may not equate with group interests. The phrase "maximum feasible participation" of the poor was purposely utilized, to the surprise of most congressmen and most mayors as well as of most early progenitors of the war, to build up in communities throughout the land countervailing structures within which the poor (or their supposed representatives) could compete for limited public and private goods and services. In many cases this "advocacy" took

place within city hall (as in Oakland), while in others it took place outside city hall (as in San Francisco). The choice, however, was not one for local officialdom to make entirely independently, for up to 1967 it was not necessary for OEO's resource stream to pass through city hall.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), in administering the model cities program, follows a more institutionalized route than OEO. The program is clearly directed at and through city halls. While citizen participation is mandated, its form and substance are left for local definition—a definition which must be approved by local governmental entities.

Despite their differences, the war on poverty and the model cities program contain, implicit in their framework, a welcome definition of local government different from that subscribed to by historical addicts of governmental reform and a planning process quite contrary to that practiced by most professionals.

Both programs view one of the prime functions of city government as resource distribution and direction. Both programs favor a local political system where political dialogue concerning resource allocation is a way of life and incremental decision-making a process and a product. Rather than utilitarian objectives, the war on poverty and the model cities program suggest specific class and/or caste objectives, and seek from local government a recognition of these objectives.

Decision-making concerning resource allocation, whether public and/or private, is premised in both programs as a result of constantly competing (and shifting) interests and constantly competing (and shifting) objectives. Both attempt to present a frame of reference, a set of conditions where competing objectives and interests can be debated and resolved through the process of adaptation, compromise, negotiation, and even contention. Both recognize the historical weaknesses of the poor in playing the resource-allocation game and both consciously attempt through fiat and process to redress this balance and assure for them an improved delivery system and some involvement in deciding the content of, and control over, that system.

The war on poverty and the model cities program define planning in resource-allocation terms. Concern for the micro environment of specific neighborhoods, specific blocks, and specific people takes precedence over concern for all neighborhoods, all blocks, and all people. Systemic, rational, and comprehensive planning is considered, correctly, to be impossible to achieve and is replaced by a more incremental, functional process and product, one that chooses the certainty of immediate predictable results rather than a long-term, speculative impact. Finally, rather than plan for, the planner is asked to plan with, the recipients of his technical beneficence; rather than separate fact and value, the planner is asked to join the two.

Advocacy.—Implementation of the war on poverty and the model cities program has resulted in a debate in the planning profession concerning advocacy. The term "advocate" has recently been used for the professional planner whose clients are the have-nots in our society. Unfortunately, neither the term nor the role it implies has ever been described in a precise manner. Therefore, it has meant all things to all people. Its shrill connotations have sent undue fear into the hearts of federal as well as local officials (particularly redevelopment directors). One well-known and well-qualified redevelopment official, after challenging the need for two sets of project planners—one to serve a community group and one from his own agency—saw the advocate as the curse of mankind, or at least of his own agency—"all you social planners who get in the way of progress."

Self-chosen (or anointed) advocates often view themselves, mistakenly, more as generals in a singular war against an often-undefined establishment. Neither the perspective of the fearsome official who often must compute success in terms of units produced rather than people benefited and must meet project deadlines nor that of the ideologically oriented, anti-establishment technician should prevail in charting this new avenue of endeavor for professionals. The term "advocate" has been borrowed from the law. Therefore, we should look there for our definition of role and process. The advocate in the legal profession is responsible for defending or prosecuting. In addition, he may "broker"

the system for clients; that is, he advises them in regard to the relationship between the law and their objectives and programs and, at times, pleads these objectives. Ultimate arbiters exist in the form of judges, juries, and/or quasi-judicial commissions, and so forth. Advocates for contending parties join issues when "facts" are interpreted differently or when the body of law applying to these facts is interpreted differently.

The planning advocate functions in much the same way. His role is to defend or prosecute the interests of his clients when he and they together think that they need prosecution and/or defense. Rather than linking the law to objectives, the planning advocate links resource and strategy alternatives to objectives. He joins issues at the request of his client when the facts interpreted by others overlook, minimize, and/or negatively affect his clients' interests. Like an attorney, the planning advocate has a choice of several avenues through which to advise his clients. These might include independence, coalition, negotiation, and/or contention. Hybrids and/or mutants are possible within each strategy over a given time. Unlike members of the legal profession, the planning advocate relies not on judges and juries as final arbiters, but on the communities' political system. In planning advocacy, unlike the due process of law, resolution of contention is not absolute and/or final but is usually incremental. As in the legal profession, the defined objectives, priorities, and ultimate strategy of the client must, in cases of conflict, take precedence over those of the professional so long as the professional-client relationship exists. The professional can always opt out if selected value systems and defined courses of action cause him moral or professional anguish.

The reason for advocacy.—The role of the planning advocate is premised on the following hypotheses:

1. The present distribution of public and/or private resources in the cities of this nation is skewed away from the have-nots to the haves. Even a cursory look at most capital improvement programs, capital budgets, bond issues, and city budgets suggests that most cities have yet to heed the imperative of the National Commission on Civil Disorders. Speaking of the need to solve the

problems of this nation's ghettos, the Commission proposed: "There can be no higher priority for national action and no higher claim on the nation's conscience."⁴

2. Even when resources are directed at the poor, at the ghettos, they fail to take cognizance of expressed needs and priorities of residents. Interviews carried out by our firm with residents in Hunter's Point (San Francisco), Oakland (California), and Bedford-Stuyvesant (New York) clearly indicate that, assuming a priority equation premised on marginal-dollar concepts, most residents would: elect "software" (social services, job training and development, education) rather than "hardware" (capital facility) programs; unlike most public planners, treat the restructuring of the physical environment as of less import than job, income, and education issues; view urban renewal as nothing less than the American tragedy or, more accurately, the American blacks' tragedy; suggest nuances as to the meaning of space and the environment rarely enunciated even by the best architects or planners (such as preferences for small, unstructured spaces rather than larger spaces; for defined block and community structure rather than democratic opaqueness).

3. Most large urban cities have not yet derived rational priority definition processes. Priorities and programs more often than not suggest an adaptive and incremental decision-making process rather than an over-all, coordinated process. Negotiation, compromise, and contention between and among several groups and individuals in the public and private sector create the rules of the game rather than any synoptic and systemic design. Ghetto residents and ghetto groups are underrepresented, both in numbers and in influence in this decision-making process. In addition, decades of discrimination, complemented by an often psychic distance from city hall and downtown and compounded by a personal priority system directed at personal rather than group survival, have impeded the effectiveness, until recently, of the poor as game players.

4. Heretofore, it has been convenient and perhaps necessary

⁴ *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders* (New York: New York Times Co.; Bantam Books, 1968), p. 2.

to imagine our local decision-making process as an expression of the community will, the public interest, and the popular consensus. The popular vote has been accepted as sanctifying the process and recent Supreme Court decisions as lending it a halo effect. Certainly, this is part of our national mythology and lends rationality to public decisions. Yet, if we are to understand the situation, it is necessary to separate myth from reality. Rather than a unitary concept, the articulated public interest in large urban areas is evidence of a dialogue between different group and individual values and different interests. More often than not, it is also indicative of the dominant strength of some publics (some values). The vote is only one tool in achieving a definition of public interest, and often only to ratify that interest.

Here again, the value systems and the interests of representatives of the poor, of the black community, have not found easy introductions to, and a sustained role in, the dialogue.

5. Even if priorities and programs were matched to the needs and priorities of the poor, the question of minimal involvement would lessen impact. Alienation from city hall and from the dominant community stems not only from ineffective delivery systems and products, but from an absence of involvement in planning, programing, and controlling that system and product. It may be unfair to picture the present relationship of most cities to most ghetto areas as white colonialism. Yet, if the resident of the ghetto assumes that this is reality and acts accordingly, facts do not matter. That this assumption of colonialism is common is testified to by every interview schedule completed by our firm in every area of the country. It is also supported by the findings of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.

First, there is a widening gulf in communications between local government and the residents of the erupting ghettos of the city. As a result, ghetto residents develop a profound sense of isolation and alienation from the processes and programs of government.

. . . Ghetto residents increasingly believe that they are excluded from the decision-making process which affects their lives and community.

The political system, traditionally an important vehicle for minorities to participate effectively in decisions affecting the distribution of

public resources, has not worked for the Negro as it has for other groups.⁵

6. The key to effective citizen involvement in ghetto areas is the ability of local groups and individuals to convert local aspirations into highly visible, creditable projects; in other words, to influence the course of the public and private resource stream. Without this constant conversion, citizen involvement quickly degenerates into personal conflict and subsequently terminates altogether. "Why come out to meetings—or go downtown—if nothing happens? . . . I got no time. . . . What's the use?"

7. Aggregation and analysis of facts involve application of one or more value systems. One set of facts can suggest to different decision-makers alternative conclusions and policies. Further, decisions as to whether to amend or exclude facts are apparent in different options relative to defining public policy and programs. Time, resource, intellectual, and value constraints prevent public or private planners from presenting the range of possible alternatives that emanate from a given set of facts.

The definition and role of advocacy.—Earlier, a plea was made that planners, particularly city planners, redefine "planning" in terms of a resource-allocation process which takes place within the physical environment but does not necessarily concern itself primarily with that environment. This plea was combined with a comment concerning the irrelevancy of over-all, long-range, coordinated planning and the relevancy of what was called functional and micro planning. Irrespective of the selected planning process, urban decision-making processes were described as adaptive, as incremental, and as evincing the contention of many groups and interests. In this milieu, facts and values were not easily separable.

If this frame of reference (which appears to be in accord with reality) is linked to a value system which defines poverty and discrimination (class and caste) as the number one priority of urban America, then the assumption of the advocate role is a claim on the professional. The claim is strengthened if the pro-

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 284, 286, 287.

fessional perceives cities as reflecting political economies of scarcity.

Advocacy in this context has a generic and even a modest meaning. That is, the planner, whether public or private, has a responsibility to present alternatives in such a way that the impact on the poor and the ghetto resident of decisions pertaining to resource allocation will be clearly recognized. Further, he would have at least the minimal responsibility of submitting program alternatives (if they are within his particular frame of reference) which indicate a benefit/cost relationship in favor of the poor and the ghetto resident. In essence, traditional concern for general city amenities, community aesthetics, vehicular access, health, should be complemented if not subsumed by concern for the priorities (physical, social, and economic) of the poor and the translation of these priorities into effective programs.

More than this might well be asked of many professionals, particularly those who are committed to using their technical expertise to convert the probability of an American tragedy into the possibility of an American dream. If the premises outlined are accepted, then there is ample justification and support for planners to serve ghetto groups in a professional relationship. The objectives of such a relationship, which follow specifically from the premises, are:

1. To facilitate a redirection of existing and a direction of new public and private resources to meet the priorities and needs of the client group
2. To facilitate the matching of available resources to realizable client objectives
3. To facilitate introduction of the many and varied value systems of the client into the local decision-making process
4. To facilitate inclusion of ghetto groups and individuals into the local decision-making process
5. To facilitate the full exposition and discussion of alternatives pertaining to resource-allocation decisions and their impact on client objectives, priorities, and needs.

Advocacy could very well be called "technical assistance." It implies evolutionary rather than revolutionary changes in the

institutional or delivery system. It suggests neither contention nor coalition as a permanent relationship between the client group and other groups (public and private). Indeed, these terms should be viewed as suggestive of strategy only and not as ends in themselves. Alternatives with respect to client response would vary by issue, by community, by stage in the planning process, by available resources and recorded priorities, by various group and individual involvement and alignment.

That advocacy can take many forms and shapes, once the professional has made the "great leap forward" of linking value to fact, is illustrated by some of the experiences of my own firm, Marshall Kaplan, Gans, and Kahn. To date we have been involved in several advocacy situations, in many of which we followed patterns usually considered in academic journals as pure advocacy; that is, in a direct professional-client relationship to a ghetto group. In addition to these assignments, however, we have also advocated what we *thought* to be the interests of the poor as best we could determine them in direct-client relationships with communities. This might be called "nondirected" advocacy or "advocacy by commitment." Between the purist role and the non-directed role, we have served in hybrid capacities. In many instances, that is, our contractual relationship was with a city, but the city asked us to work with a local ghetto group to translate their objectives and priorities into live programs.

In only one situation, that at Hunter's Point, was there contention, and this was viewed by the client, a ghetto group, and by us as strategic and only for the moment. Contention was easy to achieve, less easy to terminate. With the client's acquiescence⁶ we released a technical housing report proposing the immediate initiation of a community-owned housing development on ten acres of vacant land in the urban renewal project area. To do this would have required a redefinition of Title I boundaries to exclude the land in question. Apparently, the redevelopment

⁶No formal vote was ever taken. The organization at that time was having internal problems. Once our report was completed, a majority of Board members agreed to its release prior to submittal to city hall. We concurred. As indicated, the rationale for release was: (1) to open up the public dialogue; and (2) to use the dialogue to strengthen the community organization.

agency saw this proposal as completely alien to its plans. The director of the agency voiced his violent personal reaction even prior to reading the report.

Regardless of the merits of his later position, the intensity of the man's premature attack set the stage for an open public dialogue and helped strengthen community support for the client group. At this point, then, the clients had achieved two of their objectives; the first being entrance⁷ into the resource-allocation game with respect to what they called their environment; and the second, the creation of more visible community support.

Some of the arguments raised following the release of the report have bearing on the issues discussed here. In criticizing the proposal, the agency's consultant, an outstanding local architect, raised the "problem of building housing units at the entrance of the Hunter's Point site." We countered by suggesting that this was a proper use, given the agency's commitment to making this primarily a residential community that would offer existing residents new housing choices consistent with their needs and priorities. It is worth noting that the now published agency plan provides for similar residential use. The agency stressed that to carve ten acres from the land included in the redevelopment plan would hurt the over-all planning program and would destroy the rationality of the anticipated project plan. This argument revolves around the sanctity of the general plan, its inviolability to change and amendment, as well as the priority granted to physical as opposed to social and economic objectives. In practice, renewal boundaries are changed every day during the planning process. That the Hunter's Point planning process had not even begun, suggests that the agency had great flexibility in defining or redefining project boundaries. Other issues were raised by the agency in contending with our client's plan. Those that dealt with comparative economics were quite pertinent. On the whole, however, none made the client's plan inappropriate.

They chose contention as a way of energizing their own organization and to assure that their value system, and their interpretation of facts, entered the public dialogue. This was done success-

⁷ Entrance did not guarantee that they would win the game, but it did grant them a position.

fully. While contending with one public body, the redevelopment agency, they were trying to cement alliances with other public bodies and private groups as well as attempting to strengthen their own base in the community. Victory was not absolute for a compromise was involved; a compromise which was forced because neither the agency nor the client was certain of its strength; a compromise which was achieved by means of selective trade-offs acceptable to both disputants.

Contention, as we have said, is easier to engender than to turn off. The compromise resulted from many bargaining sessions involving city, redevelopment agency staff, federal officials, our firm, and representatives of the client group. When advocated before the client's board as the best possible political and technical resolution, the compromise, naturally, was not unanimously received. Some wanted to continue the fight, thinking that more could be won; others wanted to continue the fight, with the thought that even if all were lost, the organization would be strengthened. Our role in the community was threatened because of our strongly held position in favor of accepting the compromise. We indicated that this was the "best the client could get under the circumstances (political and technical)" and that "we believed success in achieving the compromise and in later developing the units would do more to strengthen the organization than continuing the conflict."

Life was not easy during those few days. Our ability to work with the client was for a time jeopardized. Given the alienation, suspicion, and hostility between the client and the agency, the feeling of some was understandable. Given what we felt to be our knowledge of the redevelopment process, we could take no other position. Final judgment as to the correctness of our stand must remain open. Similarly, what we would have done had the client chosen to disregard our advice can only be subjected to unnecessary speculation. The internal issue was resolved and the compromise finally ratified by a majority.

In most other instances where we have assumed an advocacy position, whether pure or nondirected, our clients, public and/or private, have striven to strengthen an existing coalition between themselves and/or other community, private, and public groups,

or to achieve such a coalition. Indeed, our role was seen as that of facilitating creation of this coalition in that, as technicians, we could supposedly help translate objectives and priorities relative to the physical, social, and economic environment into realistic programs which would combine public and private goals. Dialogue, albeit abrasive at times, substituted for overt contention. Through successful resource allocation, as in the instance of Bedford-Stuyvesant, involved citizen groups solidified their base in the community, a base which would permit them later to choose, should that be necessary, a different strategy than coalition on individual issues or, at different times, in the planning process.

"Nondirected advocacy" perhaps best describes our work on the Oakland model cities application. It is fair to say that in Oakland, as in most other large cities, the poor, particularly Negroes, feel alienated from, if not completely outside, the decision-making process relative to the allocation of resources. Indeed, the physical ecology of the city—hills occupied by white affluents, separated by limited access freeways from flatlands occupied by blacks—is, in most residents' views, white and black, remarkably similar to the social and political ecology.

Our selection by the city to assist a city-county task force to prepare what was to be a successful application stemmed from our working with the redevelopment agency on a scheme to restructure the physical environment with minimal displacement and maximum resident equity options. In implementing this assignment with the agency, our values concerning the need to minimize relocation were premised on interviews with residents and several factual analyses of the impact of prior urban renewal plans in Oakland and other cities. These values were related to, and supported by, the then new redevelopment agency director. The final report submitted to the Director and his agency won some local and national attention. It was purposely written to conform to what our office thought would be the format of the application for the as yet nonexistent model cities program.⁸

⁸ Congress enacted the model cities program shortly after the publication of the firm's report to the redevelopment agency.

To prepare the application, the city manager created a joint city-county task force and asked us to serve as staff consultants. The strains, cross currents, tensions, and resolution of tensions engendered in the process of preparing the application were indicative of the institutional and political milieu in Oakland.

The model city guidelines stressed meaningful citizen participation during the pre-application period. Yet, HUD allowed the cities only four months from publication of its criteria to submission of their proposals. While there was no doubt that Oakland might have chosen other alternatives to gain citizen involvement, given the juxtaposition of time pressures and difficulties in defining successful participation models, the city made, we felt, a reasonable and honest attempt. It chose to rely on interviews for priority definitions and on the community action agency for dialogue with, and ultimate ratification by, the residents.

The model cities legislation and criteria provided the normative frame of reference for the pre-application work, a frame of reference quite different from that of earlier federally financed planning efforts. We saw our role as that of assisting the city in developing objectives, priorities, and programs consistent with the program guidelines and with what we thought to be priorities for residents of the area. Discussion was lively and more than often tense. Our position as consultant to the task force was blurred, and we became thought of, and thought of ourselves, as staff. We provided an evaluative reference point for task force-initiated proposals, particularly those which appeared on cursory examination to depart from the guidelines. In the end, the city used us to create a dialogue with the residents.

It is fair to say, I think, that even if Oakland had not been a successful applicant, the model cities pre-application process would have been worth the effort. While no basic changes were made either in institutions or in delivery systems in this short period, tentative public commitments were made to rearrange some local priorities, some local programs. All department heads participated for the first time in a sustained process which focused their attention on the needs of a particular area and of a participating group of people. While some proposals in the document

may represent only a marginal commitment by one or more local departments, these proposals, now public, at least provided the residents with fresh opportunities for dialogue and granted citizens who participated in the planning process a frame of reference and, if needed, a bargaining position.

Oakland's present difficulties in successfully inaugurating the planning process substantiate one of the prime criticisms which could be leveled at nondirected advocacy. That is, given the felt alienation of most residents in Oakland's model cities area it was probably a mistake for us to provide a daily substitute for face-to-face involvement with residents in the planning process, however imperfect that might have been. While it is probable that priorities for residents implicit in the document are accurate, their involvement in deriving these priorities was by choice and necessity minimal and confined primarily to ratification procedures. How this could have been increased, given time and budget constraints, is open to speculation. Hindsight provides easier answers than were apparent at the time.

We have attempted, with broad brush strokes, to present a critique of the city planning process and product and, in so doing, to outline the premises that support advocacy and to define the role of the advocate. In essence, the role of the advocate was defined partly by the premises themselves and partly by the experiences of the author.

1. *Citizen participation: myth or reality.*—If participation is defined by numbers, efforts to engender participation of ghetto residents in local decision-making processes have achieved only a peripheral success. In most groups there is the symbol rather than the reality of participation, and they have created a number of more or less militant black leaders. This is perhaps no mean accomplishment. Ghetto organizations have many of the characteristics of nonghetto organizations, including fluctuating and crises-oriented membership roles, shifting and varied constituencies, and lack of sustained responsiveness.

To these similarities are added some differences, varying in intensity, which emanate from the social, physical, and economic environments. For example, members of many ghetto organiza-

tions are experienced in or favor only limited strategies when playing the resource-allocation game. Alienation, suspicion, and hostility, compounded by lack of experience, reduce the political strategies and limit the use of bargaining, negotiation, and compromise. Class rather than caste issues produce serious internal conflict in some groups, such as renters and owners, while the continuing conflict of matriarch versus patriarch for control and dominance creates instability. Like more affluent communities, the black community is in reality many communities. As in more affluent groups, the quest for personal leadership and personal recognition is apparent.

No easy answers exist for the professional as he works with his client. He must continuously resolve, as with any client, the question of his and the client's integrity. Because of the open-endedness of many assignments, he is subject to the charge of being too aggressive or, conversely, of being slow to respond, too "rational" in attempts to define and develop strategies and programs. He must constantly be aware of his own as well as the client's fallibility.

2. *The white professional*.—The question of whether the white professional can work with black clients, given existing racial tensions, is difficult to answer. That we have been able to do so with some limited success stems from our willingness to let the client group set the frame of reference. This includes the normative definition of our role as well as the process and product to be engendered. We have usually required written contracts and included a provision that we could be released on twenty-four hours' notice. This is done primarily to create the image and substance of a legal and not a paternal relationship, and to establish trust between us and the client. While the dismissal clause is probably unique, it is, we think, sensitive to the need of the client to feel secure with respect to our motives.

3. *Commitment vs. ideology*.—The reintegration of fact with values is a necessary precondition for planners who jump into advocacy. The value system assumed by the planner need only be a basic humanism, a humanism concerned with expanding the choices of the poor as a priority imperative. Values or commit-

ment should not be confused with ideology. Too often those with ideologies, whether of the Right or the Left, *use* the poor rather than are used *by* the poor. Given the complex problems facing the poor, plans premised on ideologies are at best irrelevant and at worst harmful to the specific interests of the poor, for they represent unreal, often misplaced, abstractions. As such, they provide a shaky foundation upon which to engage in the resource-allocation process. Finally, the planning process engaged in by the ideologue must be, because of the nature of ideology, a deductive one, whereas complex ghetto problems require an inductive approach.

Determining local priorities.—We commented that we now think we erred in assuming that we could convey the objectives of residents of West Oakland to the city task force and into the application. To err is human. In this case, we based our actions on an internalized value system. Model city guidelines in regard to timing gave us relatively few alternatives. In essence, the issue was not so much the correctness or incorrectness of our estimate of needs, but the need, given Oakland's history, for direct community involvement. Even if we had "hit the nail on the head" and had been able to bring about a perfect coincidence of citizen needs and proposed plans, the lack of sustained participation would have caused conflict.

The perplexing problem, however, is that the conclusions drawn from rethinking Oakland's experiences do not fit all cities. In some communities where similar sequences of events occurred, forced again by exogenous factors like federal deadlines, the opposite results accrued. In these instances, our reading of objectives and priorities apparently conformed to that of most of the residents.⁹ This fact engendered a coalition rather than an abrasive relationship with city hall. At this time, the only conclusion we can draw, and it may be premature, is that the historical response of city government to ghetto needs and the style of the present city government affect the response of residents to nondirected advocacy.

Whether advocacy is directed or nondirected, the professional

⁹ Or at least those who expressed a view.

should not think that it is easy to determine local objectives, priorities, and needs. Marginal dollar concepts fail, since all dollars are marginal. Ordinal and/or cardinal rating systems are difficult to achieve, given again prescriptive scarcity, and psychic strains resulting from decades of discrimination, that inhibits ready communication.

We have had some success in developing interview¹⁰ schedules which appear to gain insight. In addition, we have striven for direct working relationships with a range of ghetto organizations including our client groups. In the end, however, rationality is not complete, and we must rely on reasoned intuition and the veto power of our clients.

Modest claims are made for advocacy, defined as technical assistance to public and private groups premised on a commitment to a particular class and/or caste in society—the urban poor. This commitment is a necessary precondition to assumption of the role. Yet, the commitment should not be viewed by the planner as heroic; for it is now assumed to be, short of our debilitating exercise in Vietnam, one of the nation's top priorities, certainly one recognized in the model cities legislation. Advocacy defined as such should be viewed by public officials and ghetto groups alike as a positive factor, for it could help convert destructive behavior into constructive dialogue.

¹⁰ We have experimented with both black and white interviewers and have no clear-cut preference with respect to results.

Work and Incomes Policies for the Negro in Urban Slums

by *GEORGE F. ROHRLICH*

THE POOR WHO LIVE in urban Negro slums¹ constitute only part of all the poor, even all the nonwhite poor, in the United States. However, they form a large and, in social policy terms, probably the most critical problem group. On this sector of our society more than on any other one depends the social climate that will prevail in urban America in the foreseeable future and, perhaps, the quality of life in these United States altogether.

During the decade of the 1950s, Negroes overtook the white population in the rate of concentration in the big cities. In 1950, out of 15.0 million Negroes, 8.4 million, or 56 percent, lived in metropolitan areas. For the white population, the ratio was 59 percent. In 1966, 14.8 million Negroes, or 69 percent of all Negroes, lived in metropolitan areas, while for the white population the ratio was 64 percent.² Within these metropolitan areas, the Negro concentration in the central cities grew even faster, from 6.4 million in 1950 to 12.1 million in 1966—an 87 percent increase, compared with a 77 percent increase in Negro residents

¹ In speaking of "urban Negro slums" rather than of "the ghetto," my purpose is both to be specific and to avoid those connotations which attach to the term "ghetto" in its historical meaning but which are signally absent from the constellation under reference: the qualities of cohesiveness and of commitment to common values and to a common cause.

² *Social and Economic Conditions of Negroes in the United States*, Bureau of Labor Statistics, BLS Report No. 332 and Bureau of the Census Current Population Reports, Series P 23, No. 24 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), pp. 3, 8, and 9.

in metropolitan areas.³ Well over half of all Negroes (56 percent) now live in central cities.⁴

Selecting those census tracts within metropolitan areas (of 250,000 or more in 1960) with a heavy concentration of families with incomes below \$3,000, children in broken homes, persons with low educational attainment, males in unskilled jobs, and substandard housing—generally the lowest 25 percent of census tracts—and calling them “poverty areas,” the Census Bureau counted 1.56 million nonwhite families in 1960 and 1.59 million in 1966.⁵ In addition, probably around 700,000 unrelated nonwhite individuals lived there.⁶

Although by no means all the families in these poverty areas are poor, large segments of them are: in 1966, of the families living in large cities of 250,000 and over, 36 percent were poor (38 percent in 1960).⁷ Those who can leave the slum do (as is borne out by increasing numbers of Negroes who live in nonpoverty areas), but those least capable of improving themselves remain behind; and they are joined by newcomers from the South, many from nonurban areas.⁸ At any rate, 4.1 million nonwhite persons,

³ Metropolitan areas include central cities of 50,000 inhabitants or more and the urban fringe.

⁴ Out of twelve cities of 100,000 or more in which special censuses were taken in the mid-1960s, the proportion of Negroes living in the census tracts of greatest concentration (75 percent or more Negro) had increased since 1960 in all but four—most drastically in Buffalo, where the proportion jumped from 34 percent in 1960 to 69 percent in 1966. (*Social and Economic Conditions . . .*, p. 9.)

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 93.

⁶ Rough estimate derived from figures given in Mollie Orshansky's latest count of the number of poor nonwhite nonfarm families in 1966. (Mollie Orshansky, “The Shape of Poverty in 1966,” *Social Security Bulletin*, XXXI, No. 3 [1968], 10–11, Tables 5 and 6.)

⁷ In 1966, in cities from 250,000 to 1,000,000 the poor families constituted 40 percent (45 percent in 1960); among those living in cities of a million or more the ratio was 34 percent (the same percentage as in 1960, but up in New York City from 28 percent to 35 percent, and in Chicago from 33 percent to 37 percent). In the Cleveland slum of Hough, the total number of slum dwellers remained virtually unchanged between 1960 and 1965, but the ratio of families below the poverty level grew from 31 percent to 39 percent, and the median family income fell from \$4,732 to \$3,966. In the Watts area of Los Angeles, a similar comparison shows a slight (one point) decline in the percentage of poor families (from 44 percent to 43 percent), and a small upward climb of median family incomes from \$3,632 to \$3,771. (*Social and Economic Conditions . . .*, pp. 94–96.)

⁸ Between 1960 and 1966 the net migration of nonwhites from the South totaled three quarters of a million. Most of them, probably, have become part of the 2.4

including 2.1 million nonwhite children under sixteen live in poverty in central cities.⁹ They are the hard core of our target area—our target population—those whom our work and incomes policies should help to emancipate from poverty and, ultimately, from the unfavorable environmental conditions commonly associated with the city slums.

Two or three of the aspects that characterize the mode of life of large segments of this problem group provide, I believe, the most strategic openings and the greatest leverage for the application of constructive work and incomes policies.

1. The family of the urban nonwhite poor is typically large, averaging 4.8 persons as compared with 3.7 among poor urban whites. While recent figures show a very slight reduction since 1964 in the number of Negro children under sixteen who are living in city slums and in poverty (2.1 million in 1967; 2.3 million in 1964), their number still exceeds one half of the Negro slum-dwelling poor.¹⁰

2. Fatherless families and children are relatively more numerous in the urban Negro slum than elsewhere. Moreover, their numbers are on the increase.¹¹ Within the central cities 26 percent of all nonwhite families of two or more persons were headed by females. Poverty among families with children headed by females was more than twice that for families headed by males (57 percent as against 21 percent). The incidence of poverty

million increase—from 9.7 to 12.1 million between 1959 and 1966—of Negroes in the central cities.

⁹ Derived by the Social Security Administration from special Bureau of the Census tabulations from the Current Population Survey for March, 1967. (Mollie Orshansky, "Counting the Poor: Before and After Federal Income-Support Programs," in *Old Age Income Assurance*, Part II, U.S. Congress, Joint Economic Committee [Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967], p. 197.) Approximately a quarter of a million of the remaining 2 million may be children aged sixteen and seventeen.

¹⁰ This compares with a ratio of less than two-fifths that all poor children in these age groups constitute of all the poor. (*U.S. Riot Commission Report*, Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders [New York: New York Times Co.; Bantam Books, 1968], p. 261; hereafter referred to as the U.S. Riot Commission Report.)

¹¹ In 1966, of all families, those headed by a female totaled 23.7 percent, compared with 22.4 percent of such families in 1960. In the Hough area of Cleveland and the Watts area of Los Angeles, where the percentages in 1960 were 23 percent and 36 percent respectively, the fractions had gone up by 1965 to 32 percent and 39 percent respectively. (*Social and Economic Conditions . . .*, p. 69.)

among such families having children under six was 81 percent.¹² There are 243,000 such nonwhite families living in poverty in central cities. In 1965, 1.2 million nonwhite children under sixteen lived in central city families headed by women under sixty-five.¹³

3. There is this all-important matter of unemployment and underemployment. The rate of unemployment among Negroes has long been a multiple of the national rate. This holds particularly for the slum. In nine Negro slum areas, in November, 1966, it was estimated to average 9.3 percent as against 3.5 percent for the nation as a whole. In Hough and Watts, the male unemployment rates in 1960 and 1965 averaged around 15 percent. If the estimated underemployment is also included, the 1966 rate for the nine slums averaged almost exactly 33 percent, ranging from a 24-percent "low" in the Boston-Roxbury area to a 45-percent high in several contiguous areas of New Orleans.¹⁴ The latest Manpower Report of the President, which was transmitted to the Congress in April, 1968, states that in the poverty areas, "among nonwhite teenagers, nearly a third of the boys and nearly half of the girls were jobless" and that "about 60 percent of the jobless nonwhites in the standard metropolitan statistical areas were living in these poverty areas, four times the proportion for jobless white workers."¹⁵

The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders has estimated that in 1967 the nonwhite "subemployment" (unemployment plus underemployment) in the disadvantaged areas of all central cities exceeded one million persons:¹⁶

¹² U.S. Riot Commission Report, p. 263. In New York City "persistent" poverty (poverty in identical families in two successive years, 1962 and 1963) was found to be highest (befalling three out of four families) among those families headed by females. (Herbert Bienstock, "The Facts of Poverty in New York City," New York Area Chapter of the American Statistical Association, Conference on the Dimensions of Poverty, 1965; Table 24. Breakdown by color not given, but judging from other breakdowns, the rate is likely to have been higher for Negro families.)

¹³ U.S. Riot Commission Report, p. 263.

¹⁴ *Social and Economic Conditions* . . . , p. 97.

¹⁵ *Manpower Report of the President* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968), p. 84.

¹⁶ U.S. Riot Commission Report, p. 265. The concept of subemployment as developed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics actually includes in its definition: (1) those unemployed in the sense that they are actively looking for work and unable to find it; (2) those working only part time when they are trying to get full-time

Group	Unemployed	Underemployed	Total Subemployed
Adult men (age 20 and over)	102,000	230,000	332,000
Adult women (age 20 and over)	118,000	266,000	384,000
Teenagers (ages 16-19)	98,000	220,000	318,000
Total	318,000	716,000	1,034,000

The National Advisory Commission also emphasized the fact that the jobs of Negroes who do work tend to be menial, of low esteem and low in pay. It pointed out that as recently as 1966, Negroes generally were twice as likely as whites to be in the lowest-paying unskilled and service jobs.¹⁷ The Department of Labor, in a survey of ten slum areas in eight cities, found that one fifth of the full-time workers earned less than \$60 per week.¹⁸ In New York City's low-income neighborhoods, representing the lowest fifth of family incomes in 1960, three out of five jobholders were operatives, laborers, domestic workers, or other service workers.¹⁹ This maldistribution reflects, in part, lagging education and training and, in part, underrepresentation of those who have a given education among the incumbents of jobs for which their educational background ought to qualify them.²⁰ The Manpower Report of the President states flatly that "the employed poor—with earnings below the poverty line even for full-time work—now represent a larger problem, at least in terms of numbers, than the unemployed."²¹

Work policies.—Our growing concern with suitable opportunities for remunerative work for the disadvantaged is epitomized

work; (3) those heads of households under sixty-five who earn less than \$60 per week working full time and those individuals under sixty-five who are not heads of households and earn less than \$56 per week in a full-time job; (4) half the number of "nonparticipants" (not in the labor force) in the male group aged twenty to sixty-four; and (5) a conservative and carefully considered estimate of the male undercount group.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 253-54.

¹⁸ James R. Wetzel and Susan S. Holland, "Poverty Areas of Our Major Cities," *Monthly Labor Review*, October, 1966, pp. 1105-10.

¹⁹ Bienstock, *op. cit.*, Table 10.

²⁰ U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *The Negroes in the United States: Their Economic and Social Situation*, Bulletin No. 1511 (1966), Charts 21 and 27.

²¹ 1968 *Manpower Report*, p. 84.

by familiar slogans such as, "jobs for the poor," "equal (employment) opportunity," and the like. While we are far from having all the answers as to "how," at least the objective of, and the quest for, effective policies to provide gainful employment as and where needed are widely shared and understood.

The question as to what work policies ought to be applied to the slum suggests an answer which, at least on the surface, is no different from that which we would give if the same question were put with reference to the population at large. Let everyone who is of working age and who is not disqualified from working either on health grounds or by virtue of social considerations (because of being in charge of dependent children, for example) make whatever contribution he or she is willing and capable to make through gainful work to the productive effort of the nation. This is not just an expression of the "Protestant ethic"; it is just as much the Catholic ethic and the Jewish ethic, at least in our culture. Nor is it merely an attribute of capitalism. Communist countries put, if anything, even greater emphasis on this precept. What is more important for all practical purposes is the fact that the existing and rising expectations of social betterment cannot be fulfilled in any other way, at least in the foreseeable future, or cannot otherwise be met to nearly the same extent.

Well known, by now, are the obstacles that stand in the way of achieving this state of affairs by the slum population of working age in anywhere the same degree to which it has been realized by the great bulk of the population. The single most prominent and most frequently cited hurdle is the slum dwellers' lack of skills that are marketable in a city environment. Insufficient education, discouragement over the lack of promising career opportunities, and hence lack of motivation, and failure to acquire regular work habits and a creditable employment record, are frequently cited, especially by way of explaining the staggeringly high rates of unemployment among Negro youths.

Further hurdles, both economic and psychological, are said to be the lack of information about job opportunities, due to remoteness of the employment exchanges, unavailability of nearby job openings, the high cost of public transportation and in-

adequate transport service to employment opportunities that do exist, the demeaning nature of jobs actually open to many of the slum dwellers, low pay, and lack of any foreseeable chances of eventual upgrading. Last, but not least, of course, is the charge of continued discriminatory practices in hiring, apprenticeship training, and admission to union membership. The list could be extended considerably, but the point is simply to cite reasons frequently given that certain job openings continue unfilled in the face of persistent high unemployment, and that slum dwellers fail to "make a place" for themselves by creating, as it were, jobs and self-employment opportunities through their own initiative.

In the past several years, probably more research has been done than ever before on the psychosocial barriers and the motivational and general attitudinal hurdles in the way of overcoming the slum dweller's and especially the Negro's employment gap. More has been done also in systematic programing for training, retraining, and upgrading than was ever attempted in this country, with the sole exception of the large-scale industrial job-splitting and retraining programs successfully carried out during the Second World War. The findings and results, though far from unequivocal, permit reasonable hope for *long-run* success.²²

Probably most indicative of the attainments to-date is the post-training employment of 366,000 trainees within our most important training and retraining framework, i.e., under the Manpower Training and Development Act. This figure refers to the entire period from the start of the program, in August, 1962, through June, 1967. It is a worthwhile result, even if this number represents only 72 percent of the 467,200 who completed training courses and only 42 percent of the 790,400 persons who were enrolled during that period.²³ The program must continue to be

²² See *ibid.*, pp. 86 ff. and *passim*; Sar A. Levitan, *Antipoverty Work and Training Efforts: Goals and Reality* (Washington, D.C.: University of Michigan-Wayne University and the National Manpower Policy Task Force, 1967), *passim*; Task Force on Economic Growth and Opportunity of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, *The Disadvantaged Poor: Education and Employment* (Washington, D.C.: Chamber of Commerce of the U.S., 1966). (See especially the "Study Papers," pp. 123 ff. A. B. Batchelder's paper, "The Economy and the Minority Poor," reveals significant new insights into the many handicaps still obstructing the realization of equality of opportunity.)

²³ *Manpower Report of the President*, p. 307.

pursued, without a doubt, and on an increasing scale, with the justified expectation that the employment-completion-enrollment ratios will continue to improve as they have during recent fiscal years.²⁴

Nevertheless, a plausible observation made by a seasoned and astute program analyst with reference to the effectiveness as a job-training device of the youth-oriented training activities under the Office of Economic Opportunity program would appear equally relevant when applied across the board. Says Levitan:

The goal of developing new careers and equipping disadvantaged youth who missed the opportunity at school is noble and in line with our democratic tradition. However, the more pressing need of these youth is to secure a job which will provide them at least minimum support.²⁵

At present rates of training and job placement, or even at substantially stepped-up rates, twice or three times the present, the absorption of all subemployment existing in the Negro slums today might take a decade or more.²⁶ It is to be hoped that, under the likely pressure of projected manpower needs,²⁷ this hiatus may be narrowed if a real crash effort is made to do so. Even in this event, the *status quo* would continue for years to come on a rather massive scale. This would seem no longer acceptable, unless these "structural" (retraining) endeavors are buttressed by parallel employment programs of broad scope and more immediate impact.²⁸

²⁴ The ratios were: for the fiscal year 1966, 80 percent and 46 percent; for the fiscal year 1967, 78 percent and 45 percent (*ibid.*). Only about two thirds of the training program is oriented toward promoting employability and job opportunities for the disadvantaged; the remaining one third is aimed at mitigating the intensity of skill shortages. (U.S. Department of Labor, *The Manpower Development and Training Act: a Review of Training Activities* [Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967], p. 21.)

²⁵ Levitan, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

²⁶ Posttraining employment in the fiscal year 1967 amounted to 128,000. Three in ten trainees were Negro. (*Manpower Report of the President*, p. 307; *The Manpower Development and Training Act*, p. 9.)

²⁷ See S. L. Wolfbein, *The Emerging Labor Force of the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1968); L. A. Lecht, *Manpower Requirements for National Objectives in the 1970's* (Washington, D.C.: National Planning Association, 1968).

²⁸ While in no way deflating the importance of the structural measures to cope with unemployment and underemployment, this approach puts additional spending to provide jobs (with government as the employer of last resort) ahead of

The most commanding need, clearly, is for jobs with minimum adequate pay *now* for all those who can and are willing to work. How can we bridge the gap between work needs and abilities on the one hand, and work opportunities on the other?

In ruling out as a realistic possibility the instant upgrading of low-level and low-status Negro workers, the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders states:

It is far easier to create new jobs than either to create new jobs with relatively high status and earning power, or to upgrade existing employed or partly-employed workers into such better-quality employment. Yet only such upgrading will eliminate the fundamental basis of poverty and deprivation among Negro families.²⁹

Unquestionably, as the first order of priority in the area of work policies, there must be a strategic program or combination of programs aimed specifically at resolving this impasse. What is needed, clearly, are steady jobs, in sufficient numbers, that pay a living income and bestow dignity upon the incumbent, that can be filled with very little prior training and conditioning, and that require the barest amount of "breaking-in." Many jobs of this type are waiting to be created. In fact, their establishment in large numbers is a prerequisite of the Great Society, or of just a decent and safe society which affords its members the full enjoyment of their hard-earned rewards for participation in the nation's productive effort.

Let us call them "Great Society jobs." And let us endow them and their holders with the respect that one accords to the doer of essential or priority work. For, such would be their nature. Among the manifold new careers might be the following:

1. *A Corps of Guardians*: a civilian auxiliary to the law-enforcing and public service organs, including watchmen of all kinds, playground supervisors, custodians of children in public

training and retraining, which thereby become auxiliary rather than the principal approaches. (Leon H. Keyserling, "Aggregate or Structural Approaches to Achieving Employment Act Objectives," in *Twentieth Anniversary of the Employment Act of 1946; an Economic Symposium*, U.S. Congress, Joint Economic Committee, 89th Cong., 2nd sess. [Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966], pp. 19 ff.)

²⁹ U.S. Riot Commission Report, pp. 255-56.

places, and persons who perform many other custodial, informational, and related functions

2. *A Corps of Teaching Aides*: assistants to teachers, especially of younger children, in and out of classrooms, to free them of many of the "housekeeping," disciplinary, and sundry other nonpedagogic functions ancillary to their main task of teaching

3. *A Corps of Health Aides*: helpers who might be entrusted with the double function of: (a) rendering varied supportive services connected with the administration of medical and allied care in and out of hospitals; and (b) acting as resource persons to provide information, especially to mothers and children, concerning the need for, and availability of, vaccinations, medical and dental check-ups, birth-control counseling, sundry information for expectant women, and so forth

4. *A Corps of Home Aides*: visitors to households, upon request, who help with household chores in homes of the old and disabled, assist in the custody and care of children whose parents are temporarily absent, and dispense advice on, or assist with, the marketing, and so forth.

Distinctive badges or civilian uniforms might serve to underline the special character and social importance of the holders of "Great Society jobs."

The recruitment of candidates for these jobs, at least initially, should be entirely from the urban Negro slum areas. Equally important, the deployment of the holders of these jobs should be first of all and for the most part within these areas. Thus, "Great Society jobs" would provide much of the remedy both to their present lack of opportunities for gainful work and to some of the current shortfalls in their level of safety, education, health, and supportive services generally.

A simultaneous and complementary effort should take the form of an equally slum-centered, large-scale program of subsidized private employment. With due safeguards against lowering wages currently being paid by private employers of urban Negro slum dwellers, full-time employment subsidies could be used to a far greater extent than is now the case to bring the wages of full-time workers, including full-time learners, to a predetermined level.

Conversely, employers willing to accept full-time learners (regardless of age) from urban Negro slum areas might be further exempted from the minimum wage rates of the Fair Labor Standards Act.³⁰

If, over a relatively short period—say one year—the bulk of the estimated one million unemployed or underemployed persons residing in urban Negro slums can achieve by one or the other of these methods full-time employment (at minimum adequate incomes), a limited yet signal success will have been achieved toward defusing the incendiary bomb of the urban Negro slum.

Though based chiefly on federal legislation and financing, the task of implementation of both these programs may have to fall most heavily on state and local administration.³¹

To be successful, the new lines of work will have to be endowed with the character of permanence. The continuing need for the work in question, based on its usefulness (economic, social, or both), as well as for a living wage scale coupled with advancement in pay and in status, should combine to lend a career aspect to these employments, thus adding substance to their prestige—both being necessary conditions of lasting work satisfaction.³² If, by means of a crash effort along these lines, the bulk of the urban Negro slum dwellers who lack adequate employment could thus be launched within a year or two on the road to full and productive participation in the labor force, it would be hard to overstate the beneficial impact of such a venture upon American society at large.

Incomes policies.—The term “incomes policy” is rather new in American parlance. The meaning given it in recent economic literature has followed, by and large, the somewhat older European usage, which is both more specific and more restrictive than the word sense might suggest. The reason for this is to be found

³⁰ This is a modification of a recommendation concerning youth employment advanced by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. (*The Disadvantaged Poor*, p. 6.)

³¹ See Sidney A. Fine, *Guidelines for the Design of New Careers* (Kalamazoo, Mich.: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, 1967), *passim* and esp. pp. 17 ff.

³² See Arthur Pearl and Frank Riessman, *New Careers for the Poor* (New York: Free Press, 1965).

in the joint experience of many European countries, during much of the postwar period, of full employment along with creeping inflation, and in their ensuing search for policies that would facilitate the achievement of full employment *without* the undesired concomitant of inflation. Since "fundamentally, an inflationary pressure is generated when the slices which independent competing groups of citizens attempt to take out of the national cake together add up to more than the whole cake,"³³ Europe's concern throughout much of the postwar period has been with measures whereby increases in wages and incomes generally could be kept within the range of productivity gains actually realized. What came to be called "wage policy" or "incomes policy," therefore, took on the narrow and limitative connotation of an anti-inflationary tool.³⁴

A no less plausible, broader interpretation would comprise the use of the incomes medium as a lever in support of a strategy to foster employment and manpower development. In the present context, certainly, one may be allowed to take some liberty with the established terminology along these latter lines. In what follows, therefore, I shall refer to "incomes policies" in the same inclusive sense in which Wolfbein uses the term, namely, as encompassing policies of whatever kind relative to work and non-work income, earned and nonearned income, including income-maintenance payments and supportive services.³⁵

For clarity's sake, it is well to distinguish between current work income, deferred work income, and nonwork income.

Given the objectives of the proposals outlined here, the level of the current income from work in full-time employment must be such as to meet the requisites of minimum adequacy. With the typically large urban Negro slum family, however, this level of income—wherever it may be deemed to lie—is not likely to meet full basic needs. Assuming, for instance, an hourly wage of

³³ J. E. Meade, *The Control of Inflation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958), p. 7.

³⁴ See Ralph Turvey, ed., *Wages Policy Under Full Employment* (London: William Hodge & Co., Ltd., 1952).

³⁵ Seymour L. Wolfbein, *Education and Training for Full Employment* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967), pp. 10 ff.

\$2, total annual earnings would cover basic needs only barely above the poverty level for a family of five; at the somewhat more realistic low-income level it would not stretch quite enough to provide for a family of four. Except in cases of a two-earner family, therefore (which is virtually precluded by the family make-up in the bulk of cases), earned incomes would be in need of supplementation from other sources in numerous instances.

Supplementary sources of cash income of the nonearned type, therefore, will be required. Two types of programs have most to recommend them: a program of family allowances and a last-line support program of social assistance. The social assistance program is essential in order to provide minimum sustenance for those in need who cannot engage in full-time gainful employment as well as for those whose needs exceed their incomes even though they do. Its very *raison d'être* makes that program necessarily one with nationwide application. This is particularly compelling if and while, as is here proposed, the employment-generating programs are confined to our limited-target areas, the urban Negro slums. Otherwise, large-scale in-migration to the city slum would surely occur and would so aggravate the problem as to render the solutions here proposed unworkable.³⁶

A limited program of family allowances, though not essential immediately, would be of great help in raising the target population above the poverty line without resort to means-tested help. A family-allowances scheme could bring about this desirable result for most families with at least one wage earner. The allowance should be payable without regard to need for each of the first three children of any family during their years of dependence. (The cutoff that would follow the third child may be expected to constitute a positive deterrent to further childbearing.) Moreover, where there is a working father, an allowance should be

³⁶ Most likely, Negro migration will have to be subjected to some rationality in any case, if it is not to perpetuate the urban slum problem. This does not necessarily presuppose an end to all Negro out-migration from the South. The problem is far too involved to permit of simple solutions. (Charles Tilly, "Race and Migration to the American City," in *The Metropolitan Enigma: Inquiries into the Nature and Dimensions of America's "Urban Crises"* [Washington, D.C.: Chamber of Commerce of the U.S., 1967], pp. 124-47.) More likely, incentive and rehabilitation schemes for rural Negro families to remain or resettle in these areas will be called for.

paid in respect of the mother of small children, provided she is taking care of them and is not herself in gainful employment.

Existing as well as possible new or expanded programs of the deferred-income type could be relied upon to keep other families out of need without resort to means-tested programs. Particularly appropriate would be service programs of the social-insurance type or other prepaid varieties, notably programs to provide disability, maternity and sickness benefits which "stretch" current income and make it less vulnerable to costly contingencies.³⁷

Admittedly, these proposals constitute a limited-impact program for the primary benefit of only one segment of the poor. Even so, it will be a costly proposition. The direct wage bill alone, assuming an hourly wage of \$2, and disregarding capital outlay, overhead, and current materials costs (such as for distinctive clothing or uniforms) for, say, half a million holders of "Great Society jobs" would entail upward of \$2 billion a year. The cost of subsidies to private industry for the job placement of the remainder of the subemployed might cost another billion dollars or more. This \$3 billion-\$4 billion would be spent entirely on urban Negro slum dwellers in a crash effort aimed at the immediate stoppage and even the reversal of the human alienation and social decay which now characterize this population.³⁸

Is it justifiable, from a social-policy standpoint, to set in motion a comprehensive pilot program that will involve the expenditure of billions of dollars for the proximate benefit solely of some rather than all of those in need? I believe it is, for various reasons,

³⁷ For a more detailed exposition of the nonwork and deferred-work income aspects see George F. Rohrlich, "Social Assistance, Social Subsidies, and Social Services to Underwrite the Essentials," in S.A. Levitan, W.J. Cohen, and R.J. Lampman, eds., *Toward Freedom from Want* (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), pp. 34-60.

³⁸ Amounts two to three times as large will be required to mount a nationwide and all-inclusive social assistance program. Once such a program is fully operative, the introduction of a family allowance program will cause little or no additional expense in so far as it results in removing families from the assistance rolls. For families eligible for such allowances even though they are not poor, however, further additional costs are bound to accrue. (A set of cost estimates for various children's allowance proposals is contained in Orshansky, "The Shape of Poverty in 1966," pp. 22-26.) New or enlarged service programs, finally could be financed on some contributory basis with substantial weighting in favor of low-income participants and, probably, quite limited subsidies from general revenues.

including the following: by doing this we shall meet real need at one of its most explosive points; and we shall be able to judge the soundness of our approach and its more general applicability for the benefit of the rest of the needy.

A long time ago, the dual monarchy of Austria-Hungary used to try out proposed new legislation in one of its provinces. A whole new civil code was thus tested for a couple of years before it was enacted nationwide and thence remained in force. In this country it used to be said that the states were America's social laboratories. Perhaps the scene has now shifted to our inner cities. If this be true, then the case for the work and incomes policies here proposed for the urban Negro slum would seem to have a strong claim to being put to the test.

But is it sound economics? By traditional standards that gauge productivity, profitability, and economic rewards purely in the perspective of the individual firm, the answer probably has to be "No." However, it is questionable whether this rather limited gauge is truly applicable in the task that confronts us. For, what we have done, traditionally, is simply to exclude from our economic accounts those costs or, less frequently, those benefits that did not accrue to the individual business. We merely labeled them "spillover effects" or "externalities" (economies or diseconomies external to the firm) and, in most instances, took no further note of them. Galbraith, that most imaginative and socially perceptive of economists, puts it thus:

Economists and politicians still measure accomplishment by indices relevant to the popular concerns of 20 years ago. . . . If the gross national product grows adequately and unemployment declines, this, *pro tanto*, means success. If our cities, at the same time, become unlivable in part as a product of this growth and the smoke, sewage, trash and traffic that it spawns, that is unfortunate but not highly relevant.³⁹

The end of this all-too-limited interpretation of economic utility may be nearing.⁴⁰ A broader and more perceptive sort of

³⁹ John Kenneth Galbraith, lecture at New York University, reported in *Architectural Forum*, CXXV, No. 5 (1965), 61-62.

⁴⁰ See National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress, *Technology and the American Economy* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966), I, 95 ff.

socioeconomic accounting will have to be devised that will enable us to conceptualize and measure these "externalities" and, possibly, allocate their costs in such a way that they become "opportunity costs," entering into the calculation of profit and loss in some way or other. The costs of the programs here proposed may be deemed part of the price that needs to be paid in defraying the unallocated cost of doing business the way we have done it over a long period of time.

Partnership between Social Work and Law: an Essential for Effective Community Organization

by DAN MORRIS and HAROLD ROTHWAX

THERE CAN BE LITTLE DOUBT that the temper of today's social climate favors dramatic social change. The President's Commission on Civil Disorders warns that:

Our nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white—separate and unequal.

To pursue our present course will involve the continuing polarization of the American community and, ultimately, the destruction of basic democratic values.¹

However each one of us may evaluate the degree of danger to our democratic tradition and society that exists today, as social workers, we are deeply concerned with, and committed to, participating in solutions to the extremely difficult social problems that face us. While all social workers, irrespective of their specialization, are or should be concerned with social action and social change. The social work method that deals most directly with social change is community organization.

Traditionally, community organization has been practiced by the "providers" of service, who are usually influential citizens, public officials, and agency executives, aided by a professional staff. The consumers of service, in most instances the poor, have been left out of the process.

With the advent of the comprehensive juvenile delinquency

¹ *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders* (New York: New York Times Co.; Bantam Books, 1968), p. 1.

projects in 1962 and the antipoverty programs in 1964, several significant additions to the concept of community organization have been put forth:

Today . . . the field is paying increased attention to the client group with which it is engaged. Community-organization specialists are beginning to work directly with the recipients, rather than exclusively with the providers, of social welfare service.²

This concept, while not new to social work, has never been practiced on any significant scale.

Another new concept is that the social worker must become an advocate for the interests of his client to neutralize the power deficit of the poor:

In order to be effective as change agents in what is essentially a political struggle, the community organization worker must abandon the traditional role of the neutral enabler and view himself as an advocate for his clients.³

Political knowledge and skill to achieve one's ends have often been considered by social workers to be unprofessional. We have somehow believed that strong advocacy of a particular point of view and the development of techniques to achieve those ends violate our professional commitment to the democratic process. . . .

The question for us is whether our commitment to professional neutrality and noninvolvement is to continue to sustain our professional practice.⁴

On the non-social work scene, in some sectors of government, religious institutions, civil rights groups, and private business, there is increased recognition that in addition to more meaningful national programs, such as a negative income tax and guaranteed jobs, some way must be devised to give disadvantaged minority groups a real voice in the economic, educational, and political processes that shape their destiny. How the active partici-

² Charles F. Grosser, "Neighborhood Community-Development Programs Serving the Urban Poor," in George A. Brager and Francis P. Purcell, eds., *Community Action against Poverty* (New Haven, Conn.: College and University Press, 1967), p. 243.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 249.

⁴ Robert Morris and Martin Rein, "Emerging Patterns in Community Planning," in *Social Work Practice, 1963* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1963), p. 174.

pation of powerless minorities will be achieved—whether through conflict, negotiation, partnership, revolution, civil disorder, civil disobedience, or some combination thereof—remains an unanswered question.

We believe that in order for the community organization method to be effective in mounting programs of social change with the poor, a working partnership between community organization and the law is needed. This thesis is based upon an assumption and a reality. Our assumption is that social change will only occur as minority groups and the poor together with their advocates organize and take action forcefully and dramatically to bring before the community, the city, the state, and the nation the inequities and injustices of our social system together with positive programs for change. The reality is that the lives of the poor are constantly intertwined with the law.

Grosser and Sparer point out:

Coping with city slum life has many legal ramifications. It brings the slum dweller into frequent contact with public agencies created by legislative action, such as housing authorities and welfare departments, as well as with public agencies charged with responsibility for upholding the law, such as the police and the courts. As tenants, complainants, defendants, suspects, welfare recipients, public-housing residents, receivers of unemployment insurance benefits, taxpayers, litigants in Workmen's Compensation cases, and holders of installment-buying contracts, the youth and adults of the inner-city slum constantly interact with the legal establishment.⁵

Doverman supports this basic thesis in his article, "Legal Services for the Poor."⁶

And yet, citizens of all social classes interact with the law. Why should this represent such a burden and inequity for the poor? An answer to this question requires a series of responses:

1. The pursuit of justice is frequently complicated and time-consuming, requiring a hardy soul capable of enduring delays and frustration. To the poor, the law seems complicated, mysterious, and beyond their capacity, patience, and comprehension.

⁵ Charles F. Grosser and Edward V. Sparer, "Social Work and Social Justice," in Brager and Purcell, *op. cit.*, p. 292.

⁶ Max Doverman, "Legal Services for the Poor," in *The Social Welfare Forum*, 1965 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1965), pp. 96-116.

2. Legal services require money or, at a minimum, the knowledge of how to obtain these services. "The legal profession is organized around the profit system . . . the highest rewards professionally and materially go to those who serve the clients able to pay the largest fees." ⁷

3. . . . persons who find themselves impelled to receive governmental assistance are not in general, or at least always, considered to have the same political and social rights as those who can provide for themselves and their families from their own economic efforts or resources. There is behind the present welfare picture a long tradition of English and American "Poor Law," of the equation of poverty with moral inferiority, and of the fear of according rights to paupers who might thereby find some satisfaction in dependence on governmental aid.⁸

4. Although legal recourse to redress grievances is guaranteed by federal statutes under public programs, the procedures are rarely visible, are frequently complicated, and require a high degree of sophistication to employ. In addition, the attitude of these agencies is that of a withholding, impersonal, dehumanizing bureaucracy concerned with a plethora of paper work and policies rather than with the rehabilitation of people. In the eyes of the public and of most political administrations, a successful administrator is one who is "tough," saves tax dollars, and diplomatically supports the prevailing Elizabethan Poor Law philosophy of our society. No reward is given to the administrator who protects the legal rights of his clients.

More important than these factors is the constant and pervasive control that legislation and administrative law have on the lives of the poor. In our welfare state, the poor are subject to its largesse for their survival. Unlike other economic classes, their opportunities to exercise free choice due to their economic circumstances are extremely limited.

Finally, most of us assume that the law operates upon the principles of fairness, truth, inalienable rights, and that power,

⁷ Charles E. Ares, "Law School Curriculum Devoted to the Legal Problems of Indigents," in *The Extension of Legal Services to the Poor* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964), p. 181.

⁸ Alan Keith-Lucas, *Decisions about People in Need* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1957).

prejudice, and influence are foreign to the implementation and administration of justice. There is the assumption that once the legal process has been invoked, "truth will out" and justice will be done. The substance of the law, however, reflects the power, the privileges, and the preferences of those who have been listened to—and the poor have not been heard. In fact, the law is the tool of those who pay lawyers; the law schools teach courses in creditors' (not debtors') rights because creditors retain attorneys. The realities of the litigation process dictate the result far more often than does the law; the cost of the litigation and the delay in obtaining a final decision are generally more crucial factors than what the law says. This means, of course, that reason and justice and truth are rarely determinative of the outcome of legal controversy.

The judges, the courts, the structure and tradition of the law operate to impede the assertion of rights by poor people. We ask the lower-class poor to negotiate with their middle-class lawyer to persuade the upper-class judge to give them social justice. The judge, when he is not hostile, is too often remote and too undisposed to be overly critical of a society that has been perceptive enough to elevate him to the bench. Apart from this, our democratic and our legal traditions demand that the courts defer to the wisdom of the legislature; courts will not therefore nullify legislation lightly and without reference to the consensus of social feeling. The poor are likely to remain a permanent minority with neither the legislatures nor the courts ready to respond to their urgent needs sufficiently and with speed.

Despite the limitations of the legal process, it is still a vital tool in the community organization process. An analysis in depth of any serious community organization effort to effect social change in areas such as housing, consumer affairs, welfare, discrimination in employment, and so forth, immediately confronts us with a set of political, economic, and social forces supported by a mass of legislation and administrative law. These systems founded upon economic gain, social prejudice, and power skillfully use the legal process to protect their interests. Our deteriorating housing situation, the prevalence of consumer fraud against the poor,

our lily-white unions, and our bankrupt welfare system stand in mute testimony to the strength of these forces and the support they receive from our legal system.

The community organization worker, minority groups, and the poor must therefore be knowledgeable about the law and how it operates for or against the objectives they are seeking to achieve. This knowledge will add direction to the effort by helping to determine strategies based upon the realities of the antipathetical forces resisting change and the potential impact of the legal process in influencing the outcome of the action. This is not to suggest that social workers abandon their skills, knowledge, and value systems to become lawyers, or that lawyers attempt to become community organization practitioners. This is also not to suggest that all or even the majority of community organization efforts should be confined to, or require, legal action or legal counsel. What is being suggested is that no matter what community-organizing strategy is deemed to be most appropriate and effective to induce change, the community organizer must understand the important role of the law in affecting the success of the action.

We also suggest that the team of lawyer and social worker is more than the sum of its parts in adding to our resources in mounting community organizations programs. The exchange of knowledge between the disciplines, the legal profession's concept of advocacy, and the social work concepts of process, involvement, and self-determination, working together in common cause, add excitement, intellectual stimulation, balance, and innovation to our efforts.

In order for this partnership to be productive in effecting social change a large caseload is necessary. Law responds to the assertion of power. The power of the poor is in their numbers. The credit company that lives off the slum dweller depends upon the absence of challenge for its profit. The mere fact of opposition, apart from the merits, will generally induce a settlement or withdrawal of a suit because it is too costly to proceed. If a challenge to retail practices in the ghetto were to be invoked by every poor person affected, those practices would soon cease or be altered. It is not

the substance of the law but the availability of the process that is crucial and relevant. The widespread use of that process by the poor is far more significant than what the law says.

The law cannot be used as an instrument of social change without the power of numbers (caseload) because of the doctrine of mootness. A court will not reach the issues implicit in a case if the actual controversy has been resolved. For example, a client was cut off welfare because, in an early morning raid without a warrant, she was found to have a man in her home. When we sought to challenge this practice, the welfare agency merely restored the woman's benefits. The agency was able to continue its practice because by "buying us out" the court would not reach the ultimate issue.

The power of the caseload is the power to persist and to apply unremitting pressure. If we were able to bring an action against an agency every time it engaged in the practice of early morning raids it could not buy us out without changing the policy in fact. The written law might remain the same, but it would no longer be the reality.

It is this persistence and pressure which effect change. Power must be confronted. The poor have this power by virtue of their numbers and their concentration. The community organizer is the link between the poor and the law.

We already have practical experience in utilizing this approach in selected community organization projects throughout the country. Several cases in our experience at Mobilization for Youth (MFY) illustrate this approach.

In the fall of 1966 we received many complaints from welfare recipients that they were not receiving their special grants for winter clothing. This was especially distressing where children were involved, for it meant that some would not be able to go to school and others would have to risk illness. The problem was not one of denial of eligibility but of delay so prolonged that it was tantamount to denial. The social worker could only plead the need of the client and the justice of the claim. Unaided, the client could not disturb the apathy of the bureaucrat. He was unable to trigger the basic principle of action within our system: make

it impossible for them to ignore you and make it easier for them to give in than to resist. This impotence fortified within the client his feelings of dependence, helplessness, and fear. There was a clear reluctance to challenge the system.

Aggressive community organizers who had worked closely with welfare recipients persuaded a few of the more courageous to resort to the legal unit of MFY. The intervention of the attorneys was almost immediately successful. This was not, it should be noted, because the lawyers were more persuasive or more articulate but because they were able to threaten the placidity, the convenience, and the invisibility of discretionary decision-making; they could "rock the boat." Nothing succeeds like success, and it is contagious. Shortly thereafter, with the assistance of community organizers and MFY lawyers, three welfare recipient groups were formed. This would not have been possible if the recipients had not felt that they were protected against retaliation by the welfare agency. Whether this apprehension was real or imagined, there was clearly a need to feel protected, although the clients were acting entirely within the law.

With the growth in organization (these groups spread throughout the city and into all the boroughs) came a growth of aspiration. A campaign to bring every recipient up to minimum standards got under way. There were clearly not enough lawyers to service this great need. The fact-gathering, the coordination, the correspondence were beyond the capacity of the lawyers. In fact, most of what a lawyer does can be done by nonlawyers. Forms were drawn up so that the client groups could perform much of this task themselves with little training. Community organizers, VISTA workers, and law students all engaged in an undertaking that would have been impossible without them.

To understand the dimension of this effort it is important to note that in 1965 there were fifteen fair hearings in the state of New York. In the six-month period beginning August, 1967, approximately twenty-five hundred requests for fair hearings were filed in New York City alone. This resulted in a staggering load of hearings. Referees were called out of retirement, and the legal staff of the Department of Social Services was expanded.

Again, the lawyers for the recipients could not have managed a task of such magnitude without the closest cooperation of community organizers and, through them, the recipients. As a result of this campaign approximately \$300,000 was recovered from the Department of Social Services. Many of the requests were granted prior to the hearing. It is worth recalling that the department had, throughout this period, an affirmative obligation to bring its constituency up to minimum standards; yet a massive challenge was necessary to call it to its duty.

Welfare recipient groups now exist nationwide. They are no longer, if they ever were, the creatures of community organizers and attorneys. With strength and confidence they have asserted their independence and broadened the definition of their objectives to include a critique of the entire welfare system. Lawyers work for them as they do for any other client; they advise, they do not control.

The welfare experience is the most dramatic example of the interdependence between law and social work, but the pattern is replicated in every area of poverty law. Housing provides another opportunity for community organization involvement. New York law permits tenants to seize the initiative in seeking to ameliorate the conditions under which they live. Under Article 7A of the Real Property Actions and Proceedings Law one third of the tenants in any given building may bring their landlord into court, prove the deleterious conditions which exist in the building, and ask the court to appoint an administrator who will collect all the rents and apply the funds toward the cost of making the necessary repairs. Article 7A represents one of the most effective ways of dealing with the landlord-tenant relationship. It is, of course, useless unless the tenant is aware of the remedy and is encouraged to make use of it. At MFY we have used community organizers to seek out buildings whose condition seemed suitable to this approach; occasionally, the community organizer has responded to the complaint of a single tenant and then organized the building. The organizer explains to the tenants what the law is about and how it operates; he makes contacts with the architects or engineers who will make their expert assessment of

the condition of the building and accompanies them on their investigation; he will often get the building inspected by city code enforcement personnel; he sees to it that the tenant gets to court; once the case is won (and more than 90 percent are), he is the liaison with the administrator; if the landlord has chosen to settle out of court the organizer will supervise the agreement to assure that the necessary repairs are made. Throughout this process the organizer is indispensable to the lawyer and the client: he permits a close working relationship between the parties; he facilitates their coming together; he is there for the follow-through; he eases the burdens of the lawyer and the fears of the client; he is the bridge that enables the cooperative effort to succeed.

This partnership between lawyer and community organizer has also been effectively utilized in areas of direct action, such as picketing and demonstrating. It has aided voter registration drives and consumer-education programs. In almost any group endeavor involving the poor, knowledge of the law and access to lawyers are basic requisites. Though necessary, they are not by themselves sufficient.

There are generally too few lawyers for the poor, and there is an enormous need for the nonlawyer to assume many tasks that do not require legal training. The attorney is generally unable to achieve the closeness and continuity with clients necessary to overcome fear and dependence. The community organizer, on the other hand, needs credibility and a wider choice of weapons; the lawyer, often unused but always available, is a crucial part of that armament. Advocates, lawyer and organizer, make the social process visible, accessible, and understandable.

Equal justice requires equal access to the centers of power and an ability to contend against and confront one's adversaries. Social change will reflect the strength of the pressure brought to bear on those presently invested with power. The law is neither abstract nor disinterested. It is illusory to believe that we live under a rule of law and not of men. Men make the law, they interpret it and they implement it—and in so doing they order society in their image. Those who are excluded from this process suffer by that

exclusion. The struggle to use law as an instrument of social change is an effort to be weighed in the balance. It is a desperate struggle in which reason and justice have only marginal relevance. Law is power enthroned and made respectable. Only countervailing power will compel change or compromise. The poor will have justice when they can demand it, not when they deserve it. It is the responsibility of the lawyer and social worker working together to make their contribution toward achieving this end.

A National Communication System in Social Welfare

by JOE R. HOFFER

“COMMUNICATION” is a many-splendored term. Animals are being taught by psychologists to communicate among themselves and also with humans. Brainwashing has returned to the headlines. The communications process is fundamental to all our psychological and social processes. It is essential on the neighborhood level as well as on the international level. Lippitt reflects that

if alienation is the preferred term used these days to denote separateness or disconnection or removal, then perhaps communication might be the preferred term to denote connection, or in touch with, or linked to. . . . Communication, of course, can have a lot of purposes to influence, to inform, to sell, to call attention to, to orient, to warn, etc.¹

Communications is a major problem for a national association. How do we get the members to identify closely with the association? We attempt to get information from our members who have it and pass it on to members who need and want it.

There are three elements² that can be varied to improve existing communication programs:

1. *Information*.—What kind of information are we trying to communicate to our members, to the profession, the social welfare field, allied fields, and the general public?

2. *Expression*.—How do we communicate this information?

¹ Ronald Lippitt, “Communications within Social Welfare,” National Conference on Social Welfare, 1967.

■ Raymond Lane, “A Look at Association Communication,” *Association Management*, December, 1963, pp. 21-26.

Is our expression beamed to our audiences on the right frequency, at the right time, through the right channels?

3. *Audiences*.—Do we know the characteristics of our specific audiences, their needs and resources, their problems and their backgrounds?

In my 1967 paper on the role and contribution of the National Conference on Social Welfare (NCSW) to planning and social action³ I analyzed the contribution of a large forum in providing a sound education base for social welfare planning and social action. I proposed one or more cooperative coalitions, alliances, or working relationships between NCSW and the so-called "umbrella organizations" as a practical means of working on some common problems faced by the social welfare field.

These proposals grew out of some tentative assumptions and principles which were based on a partial use of systems analysis for the large or comprehensive forum as a subsystem in the social welfare system. This article is a companion piece with special emphasis on the interchange of ideas and experience—one of the major objectives of the NCSW.

I shall retain the definitions and guidelines previously suggested, namely, that "a system will be considered a set of operations organized in an orderly or logical arrangement to meet specific objectives based on definable needs and wants";⁴ furthermore, that the large or comprehensive forum is a subsystem in the social welfare system allied with other systems, such as educational, political, communications, and the social agency.

The NCSW objective which is pertinent to our present concern is stated as follows:

To provide a medium for interchange of ideas and experience between volunteers and paid workers, racial groups, specialties within the field, governmental and voluntary agencies, and sectarian and nonsectarian groups.⁵

It is significant that this objective is related primarily to vertical communication, that is, within the social welfare field. To some

³ Joe R. Hoffer, "The Large Forum in the Social Welfare System—Planning and Action," in *Social Welfare Forum, 1967* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967), pp. 85–103.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 85.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 87.

extent it also implies horizontal communication, that is, with allied fields. There is no reference to an interchange with the general public, which has been essentially the domain of public relations programs of national social welfare organizations.

The basic methods of communication include the spoken and written word and the audio-visual media. The communications system is comprehensive and at times overpowering. Yet in spite of the awesome importance of the communication system to every human being, every group, and every society, we know less about it than we do about the life cycle of the bat or the pecking order of the chicken.

Prominent among the groups and services operating in the communications system within the social welfare system are: television, radio; newspapers, periodicals, and other publications; museums, libraries, and information services; conferences and forums; and related professions and fields.

The NCSW Public Relations and Development Committee in 1967 invited Ronald Lippitt, a research scientist, to draw from research and development in other large social systems material on the problems of communications within social welfare. His Annual Forum paper,⁶ based on a framework for analysis, suggests three ways to look at communications in social welfare:

1. Vertical communication within the social welfare field, that is, from the national to a regional to a state community to local units to an individual member
2. Horizontal communication between persons or groups in different parts of the social welfare field who make up the different segments
3. Horizontal communication between "insiders" and "outsiders," who are in other fields or in some segment of the public outside ourselves, as one part of the public.

He presents illustrations largely from a national study of an allied helping profession with over a million members, organized into a large number of subprofessional societies. In addition, he contributes additional data at the community level of all the agencies and groups concerned with children and youth. I com-

⁶ Lippitt, *op. cit.*

mend these illustrations for serious consideration at some future date. I suggest, however, that it would be more realistic and profitable to consider the social welfare field as our basic unit, which will, of course, include the social work profession as its major discipline.

The most frequent problems in vertical communication reported by Lippitt were: dissatisfaction of local members and units with upward influence on policies and on activities; a feeling of being bypassed; and the lack of involvement in national action efforts.

Since it is evident that this term "communication (s)" is much too broad a concept for present purposes, I shall be concerned not with defining but with analyzing some of the administrative procedures of one communication system in social welfare, that of the NCSW. The purpose of this analysis is to evaluate the effectiveness of the system and to relate it to the other communications systems in social welfare operated by the umbrella organizations: the American Public Welfare Association; the Council on Social Work Education; the National Assembly for Social Policy and Development; the National Association of Social Workers; and the Social and Rehabilitation Service (formerly the Welfare Administration) of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. These organizations have similar communication objectives and include most of the social welfare community in their memberships and target audiences.

COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS IN SOCIAL WELFARE

The major informational efforts of the umbrella organizations have been in vertical communication. In recent years there has been greater concern for horizontal communication. Unfortunately, there is little research data available in our field on the effectiveness of these activities, and therefore we must turn to other fields.

Vertical communication.—Most of the the efforts by the umbrella organizations to improve the flow of information have taken the form of journals, proceedings, papers, meetings, abstracts, and other formal services. An impressive list of periodicals and publi-

UMBRELLA ORGANIZATION PERIODICALS
AND PUBLICATIONS

American Public Welfare Association

APWA Letter to Members	(Intermittent)
APWA Washington Report	(Intermittent)
Public Welfare	(Quarterly)
Public Welfare Directory	(Annually)

Council on Social Work Education

Graduate Professional Schools of Social Work	(Annually)
Journal of Education for Social Work	(Semiannually)
Social Work Education Reporter	(Quarterly)
Social Work Fellowships in Canada and the United States	(Annually)
Statistics in Social Work Education	(Annually)
Undergraduate Departments of Colleges and Universities offering Courses with Social Work Content	(Annually)

Department of Health, Education and Welfare

(Social and Rehabilitation Service—Formerly "Welfare Administration")

Aging	(Monthly)
Children	(Quarterly)
Welfare in Review	(10 months, annually)
Indicators (discontinued June, 1967)	

National Assembly for Social Policy and Development

Assembly Letter	(8 months, annually)
National Conference and Convention Dates	(Semiannually)

National Association of Social Workers

Abstracts for Social Workers	(Quarterly)
Encyclopedia of Social Work	(5 years approx.)
NASW Directory	(5 years approx.)
NASW News	(Quarterly)
Personnel Information	(Bimonthly)
Social Work	(Quarterly)

National Conference on Social Welfare

Conference Bulletin	(Quarterly)
Directory of State Planning Organizations for Health and Welfare	(Semiannually)
NASHAW Newsletter	(Semiannually)
Annual Forum Publications	
Annual Forum Program	(Annually)
Daily Bulletin	(4 issues)
Social Welfare Forum	(Annually)
Social Work Practice	(Annually)

cations (see preceding page) is mailed on a regular basis to participating members and subscribers. However, research findings⁷ in other fields demonstrate that high proportions of information come to individual practitioners, especially researchers and teachers, through informal, often unplanned, person-to-person communication. This has been called "the invisible college." There is some evidence that this is true in social welfare.

The journals and proceedings of conferences in their present form may be obsolete as major channels of vertical communication. The original purpose of these publications was to keep the practitioner abreast of new developments in his specialty. There is question whether they fulfill that purpose. A study by the American Psychological Association (APA) of its internal information exchange revealed:

Work published in the *Psychological Journal* this month was started on the average between 30 to 36 months ago. Approximately 18 months later, or between 18 and 20 months prior to publication, the work reaches a stage in which a rather complete report of it can be made. At this point, during the period between 15 and 18 months prior to publication, reporting of the research starts. The first reports are very informal and take place at colloquia within the producer's own institution. During the same period a more formal oral report is likely to take place at a meeting of the small, special interest group. Also during this period, the producer starts the writing up of the work.

Shortly after the author has started writing up the work (12 to 15 months prior to publication), a formal oral report may be made available to reasonably large audiences at national or regional meetings. About one in five articles is reported at national meetings and one in ten at regional meetings. When such reports occur they are usually separated by a year and follow some modification in content. In the case of the work reported to the APA Annual Convention, the first public announcement is made in the form of listing of the title and abstract, and the published program distributed to all APA members prior to the convention. Although the convention presentation could be heard by up to three thousand attendance at regional and up to 10,000 at national meetings, the number attending a particular paper session rarely exceeds 100.

⁷ *Communications Systems and Resources in the Behavioral Sciences*, a Report by the Committee on Information in the Behavioral Sciences, Division of Behavioral Sciences of the National Research Council (Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1967), pp. 7-10.

A formal form of written dissemination and distribution of copies of the presentation occurs shortly after the convention—depending on the meeting and distribution of its program. 70% to 100% of the authors receive requests for copies. Usually, however, there are few requests for any single presentation.⁸

This example from an allied field may not be an accurate description of what occurs in the social welfare field, but it does suggest three features which need constant attention if journals and the proceedings of conferences are to continue as our main channels of vertical communication:

1. The lag between submission of a manuscript and its publication
2. The lag between publication of an article and publication of its abstract
3. The annual national meeting, or the Annual Forum, and its role in the publication program.

Of all the channels within a communication system, the large forum offers the greatest range, both in degree and in number of opportunities for communication. A participant can respond to a presentation and establish contact with its author to almost any degree he chooses—from merely glancing at the abstract or descriptive paragraph in the program, to attending the session, to approaching the author to discuss specific questions or to pursue common technical interests. This elaborate informal subsystem of the large forum can be a feature of particular interest in designing innovations and communication.

The impact of the spoken word on the individual attender is greater, however, than that of the printed word. The personality of the speaker gives life and spark to his ideas. There are increased opportunities to receive inspiration or a "lift" which will help the individual when he returns to the everyday job. A forum would fail in its mission, however, if the individual attender did not carry some message back to his colleagues and agency that will enrich their professional growth through in-service education. If we use all means of communication available to us, we can say that a speech given at a large national forum will be heard around

⁸ American Psychological Association, *Reports of APA Project on Scientific Information Exchange in Psychology*, I (1963), 6-8.

the world. As a result, proceedings might assume most of the functions of a short-life publication of brief reports, while the journals are allowed more leeway to publish articles that report a series of studies organized around a central theme or theory.

Investigations have been made of the ways in which preforum publication of papers influences behavior relative to the exchange of technical information. Questions such as the following were studied: Who read the papers? Who were the authors of the papers? Who attended the presentations? Who requested copies of papers from authors? Who purchased the published proceedings? What modification of technical and other related work resulted in familiarity with reports in the proceedings?

In any field or profession the problem of information reflects three major concerns.⁹ These in logical order are: relevance, accuracy, and accessibility. If information is not relevant, we need not worry about its accuracy. If it is not accurate, we need not fret over its accessibility.

Not only is there an opportunity to make significant progress in the communication apparatus itself with the use of modern technology, but there is also the extremely promising possibility of using an improved system to help overcome the worrisome handicaps connected with relevance and accuracy.

A paradox noted by more than one investigator is the regularity with which scientists attend meetings of scientific societies. And yet, they declare with almost equal regularity that the papers presented at such meetings are of little use to them. Among the particular features of the meetings from which scientists claim to have derived most benefits, the role of informal contacts looms quite large when juxtaposed to that of the official program. This is true especially for true researchers. Moreover, it is precisely these scientists who appear to be the most frequent meeting attenders. Those who are most active in research and most highly qualified academically most frequently deny obtaining significant information from meetings.

Reading more does not mean reading less intensively—it appears that there is no conflict between seeing many journals and

⁹ Kingsley Davis, "Foreword," in *Communications Systems and Resources*, . . .

reading them thoroughly. It seems plausible to conclude that seeing many journals and reading them thoroughly reflect the same factor. This is inferred from the finding that those who claim regularly to see many journals classify as "read" rather than "scanned" almost as large a proportion of their journals as do those who claim to see few.

Literature, in some circles, is used more for ideas than for reference. The conclusion of the technologists in a Columbia University Bureau of Applied Social Research sample revealed that the main function of technical literature is not to serve as a reference course for consultation, but as a primary source of stimulation.

Horizontal communication.—Social problems have multiple causes, and their solutions accordingly require a multidiscipline approach, which is facilitated by the fact that technology, the natural sciences, and the social sciences are closely interrelated (a point of view that is making itself increasingly felt in educational theory). The deterioration of the inner city is an example of a typical complex social problem that will yield only before such a unified attack. Solutions to social problems have been suggested by findings from such varied fields as astrophysics, sensory psychophysics, and population studies, as well as from the more theoretical social sciences, whose influence can be seen in their application to problems of urban development.¹⁰ *Abstracts for Social Workers*, published by the National Association of Social Workers (NASW), provides an excellent service by informing the social welfare field of significant manuscripts from related fields that are published in selected periodicals.

The new National Assembly for Social Policy and Development represents a potential of horizontal communication system for social welfare and allied fields. Included in its specific functions is that of bringing about "increasing public understanding of problems and possible solutions."¹¹ Social, physical, and

¹⁰ Joe R. Hoffer, "The Relationship of Natural and Social Sciences to Social Problems and the Contribution of Information Scientists to Their Solutions," *American Documentation*, XVIII, No. 4 (1967), 228.

¹¹ *A Plan for Program and Financial Development* (New York: National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, 1968), p. 1-A.

economic planning, the plan for program and financial development emphasizes, are intrinsically interrelated, and the gulf which in the past has separated them in practice is narrowing.

In addition to its 300 individual members the National Assembly will have natural linkages with national public and voluntary organizations which will be formally related to the Assembly as Associated National Organizations, and with state and local planning organizations which will be formally related as Associated Planning Organizations. This multiple constituency will bring together professional and lay, public and voluntary, and national, state, and local interests. The public sought will include legislators and the general public.

WHAT SHOULD BE COMMUNICATED?

The content of communications by the umbrella organizations is determined by each group. It is rare in social welfare, whether under governmental or voluntary auspices, to find two national organizations with identical objectives. Each one typically enjoys considerable autonomy, and many are headed by directly elected or appointed members who are independently answerable to the members of an official body. Each administrator is understandably intent on carrying out the particular purpose of the agency for which he has responsibility. Each agency has its own objectives and carries them out as best it can, with as much coordination between and among other national agencies as good will, good politics, and revenue opportunities make possible.

But even the most competent and dedicated public officials and board members in social welfare are confronted with the fact that no one sector or agency controls a significant proportion of the variables which guide the destiny of social services in the United States. Therefore, there has been a growing interest by some of the umbrella organizations in improving the internal communication within the social welfare field and in mounting a broad program of interpretation of social welfare to the general public. A cursory review of our literature suggests some emphases for the immediate future:

Sanford Solender thus summarizes the problem:

Weaknesses in public understanding of social welfare results in ignorance of its problems and potentialities and inadequate evaluation of its services, with detriment to the financing of programs and recruiting professional and lay workers. Liaison with communication media is poor, and where the media deal with social welfare, the message often is not helpful. Even worse, social welfare itself persists in interpreting its work in antiquated terms. Appeals are still based upon sordid conditions of previous generations, and there is failure to tell the story in terms of modern needs and services. The void in public appreciation of social welfare and its problems places the profession of social work in a vulnerable position. Every attack on public or voluntary social welfare threatens the whole field.

. . . At a time when the importance of state organization for social welfare is better recognized than ever before, the stirrings of state conferences to become planning and action organizations evoke too little response. There has been no agreement nationally on a plan to afford service to these state bodies.

.

National agencies too often defend institutional stakes and the *status quo* rather than advocate creative change. Too frequently they are absorbed in their institutional framework to the exclusion of relationships with the larger social welfare scene. Barely more than a year ago, the report by Dr. Robert H. Hamlin on voluntary health and welfare services in America raised important questions, contending among other matters that adequate accounting to the nation by national bodies was lacking. In few respects is social welfare nationally as vulnerable as in regard to its unplanned conferencing patterns.

.

New dimensions of public understanding of social needs, their impact on people, and the requirements for social services which they evoke are an urgent necessity. We must achieve—especially on the national level—a concerted, total-field approach to this problem with its nationwide implications. A dramatic breakthrough in public education about social welfare is a prime necessity at this time. The current project of the American Public Welfare Association which deals with this problem is the type of concentrated attack which is required. The program of the State Charities Aid in New York State to effect changes in the attitudes of key community leaders is noteworthy.¹²

The NASW Commission on Practice designated “knowledge” as one of the constellations of elements that mark social work as a

¹² Sanford Solender, “The Challenge to Social Welfare in America,” in *Social Welfare Forum, 1963* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1963), pp. 9-10, 15-16.

profession different from other professions.¹³ It is also one of the twelve categories in the proposed NCSW classification of the social welfare field.¹⁴ Social work is now giving its knowledge base the careful analysis that the practice methods have already received.¹⁵

Taber and Shapiro¹⁶ studied the profession's periodical literature as a contribution to this analysis of social work in relation to its knowledge base. The journals *Social Work*, *Social Casework*, and *Social Service Review* were selected as representing the main body of periodicals. A systematic sample of articles was taken from each journal through 1963. The sample included 124 articles, one from each year of publication of each journal, covering almost fifty years of social work periodical literature. A content analysis, that is, a method of abstracting selected features from a large body of communicative data in a systematic and quantitative way, was used. The findings provide some useful data:

The fields of practice were widely represented in the sample.

In 105 of the 124 articles, some problem was explicitly identified for consideration. Many of the problems could be classed as "societal" (fifty papers); twelve papers treated problems of the social work profession itself; while other problems accounted for three articles.

Almost all of the 124 articles included some empirical references. Empirical material was defined as "statements based on experience, observation, or data pertaining to, or founded on, experiment."

Slightly over half of the material, or 53 percent of the total, was classified as nonempirical. Nonempirical statements included

¹³ Working Definition of Social Work Practice, in Harriett M. Bartlett, "Toward Clarification and Improvement of Social Work Practice," *Social Work*, III, No. 2 (1958), 5-8.

¹⁴ Joe R. Hoffer, *Manual for a Hand-Sort Punch Card System for Indexing Social Welfare Publications* (rev. ed.; Columbus, Ohio: National Conference on Social Welfare, 1966).

¹⁵ For two analyses with similar conclusions, see Alfred Kadushin, "The Knowledge Base of Social Work," in Alfred J. Kahn, ed., *Issues in American Social Work* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), pp. 39-79; Alfred J. Kahn, *The Nature of Social Work* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954).

¹⁶ Merlin Taber and Iris Shapiro, "Social Work and Its Knowledge Base: a Content Analysis of the Periodical Literature," *Social Work*, X, No. 4 (1965), 100-106.

value preferences, recommendations for action, or statements about phenomena supposed to exist but not directly observable.

Evidence of borrowing knowledge from other fields was found in the use of recognized authorities, concepts, and theories for exposition or interpretation.

In short, there was much evidence of potential for development of knowledge and more sophistication in the use of theory and facts than in recent years.

A cursory examination of NCSW publications during this same period discloses similar observations.

The National Public Relations Council is exploring ways in which it might play a more active role in fostering better communications and relationships between social agencies and ghetto residents. As the first step of a project it is calling "Communication and the Inner City," the Council's board of directors, in a self-survey, recently responded to a questionnaire on the subject. This was followed by an all-day conference to consider the responses and their implications. Excerpts of responses from the board of directors include:

What problems does your organization face in communication with and relating to inner-city residents?

Inner-city residents hard to involve. . . . They don't like or trust outsiders. . . . Lack of communicators who can understand—and be understood by—the poor. . . . Inner-city residents view the daily press as "privileged" man's medium. . . . Clients don't know what's due them. . . . Agencies lack sufficient resources to do the job.

What are underlying causes of the problems?

Discrimination in jobs, education, housing. . . . Social agencies are middle-class oriented. . . . Staff values differ from those of inner-city clients. . . . Services in inner-city are inadequate or non-existent. . . . Governmental, private agencies are too paternalistic. . . . Inner-city residents are not represented by boards of directors or volunteers.

What methods, approaches have been tried to improve the situation?

Use of indigenous residents in programs. . . . Pre-testing of educational materials. . . . Development of educational material in Spanish. . . . Door-to-door educational programs. . . . Recruitment of minority representatives to serve as board members, campaign volunteers. . . . Use of Negro press, Negro-oriented radio.

What worked? What didn't?

Participation of the poor improves communication with them, encourages them to use services. . . . Face-to-face encounters have beneficial results. . . . "Usual" films and leaflets do not work. . . . Media can help if they feature communicators "acceptable" to target audiences. . . . Efforts to involve poor must be sincerely motivated.

What other ways need to be tried?

Board and staff members need to become interested in and better informed about problems of poverty and how to work effectively with inner-city people. . . . Involve inner-city residents as aides, counselors, planners, and policy-makers. . . . Speak out in behalf of inner-city needs. . . . Admit middle-class short-comings, avoid condescending language. . . . Tailor more educational materials to minority groups.¹⁷

Dr. Paul Weinberger states:

High professional status is seen as a positive incentive for the recruitment of individuals into a profession. Social work does not enjoy high professional status. One good reason is that we are too busy talking to each other. We need to spend more time telling the American public who and what we are. We need to report our successes more effectively and learn to accept our failures and move on.¹⁸

Public relations is the most effective means of interpreting community needs and agency services. However, some agencies continue to fear publicity, others use inappropriate techniques, while others think of publicity as "cheap" and not suitable for such a serious endeavor as adoption, for instance. Successful programs have shown that a clarification of goals is essential so that the use of professional skills in public relations can be consistently related to them. To the end that upsurge for the demand for service will be accompanied by an increase in resources, community needs and interests must be emphasized throughout. Furthermore, public relations should be an integral part of administration rather than an extra chore for hired staff.

It is evident from these few selections that problems exist in communication on both levels, vertical or internal and horizontal

¹⁷ *Channels*, February 15, 1968.

¹⁸ Paul Weinberger, "Assessing Professional Status in Social Welfare," *Personnel Information*, X, No. 4 (1967), 1.

or external. These problems are related to knowledge, services, gaps in services, duplication of efforts, noncommunication between segments in our society, and ineffective use of the communication system.

WHAT CAN NCSW DO?

The large generic forums—the NCSW, the International Conference on Social Welfare (ICSW), and state conferences—have been important channels for rapid and immediate exchange of social welfare information. Three stages can be identified: the preforum period, the forum period, and the postforum period. All three stages are equally important in the communications process although we are emphasizing only the forum period.

The preforum or program preparation period begins from one to two years before the opening day of the forum. In the NCSW and the ICSW, from thirty to eighty groups scattered over the United States and the world engage in formulating program plans or compiling country reports. The preliminary programs are distributed to 15,000 individuals and organizations in accordance with a definite plan. Several thousand copies of the U.S. Report prepared for each international conference are mailed out. While these publications complement the more extensive promotional pieces, they are essentially a communication tool.

The central focus of the forum period has been on the meetings, and little attention has been given to the exposition—a massive consultation service on the full range of social welfare problems and services—the film theater, or the informal and *ad hoc* conferences and discussion. The press room is geared to horizontal communication or, more specifically, to the general public. The final program is designed to be a communication tool and serves as a planning device after the forum.

Unfortunately, we lack objective data on many of these services and programs. Studies in other fields are pertinent,¹⁹ and some of the findings may help us to improve the communication potential. For example, the seeking of a specific piece of technical or scientific information is more frequent at the national than at the

¹⁹ American Psychological Association, *Reports . . .*, p. 66.

regional meetings. While contributed papers are rarely sources of significant information at national meetings, they are the most frequent formal source at regional meetings.

One of the striking aspects of a log study conducted by the APA was the prevalence of informal symposia, colloquia, seminars, research conferences, and meetings attended by individuals for the purpose of information exchange. Of special interest to our concerns was the individual who attended a large number of these meetings and then spent considerable time imparting the information gained to his colleagues or students.

The postforum services have received increasing attention in recent years, especially in the NCSW. A broad-gauged information service based on a coordinative indexing system of all NCSW publications, 1874-1962, is in its third year. The *KWIC (Key-word in Context) Index*²⁰ and the Selected Bibliographies, approximately 180 to date, have been described in various NCSW materials. These services provide an efficient and inexpensive method for the retrieval of published papers.

Since only about 30 percent of the manuscripts submitted during any one forum are published, the NCSW has initiated several other services which make the balance of the documents available. Manuscripts are selected by the NCSW Editorial Committee for inclusion in the new SCAN (Short Conference Abstracts and Notes) program. From forty to seventy manuscripts are included in SCAN; the other manuscripts are kept for a one-year period, and individual orders are filled upon request. Approximately a thousand orders were filled in the past twelve months.

The NCSW has also experimented with a Speakers' Index (subject, participant, and auspice) of all meetings held by thirty-three state conferences and the NCSW in 1966. This Index will be published every three years. In the interim, the individual state conference programs will be duplicated and indexed.

Still another contribution made by forums are manuscripts devoted to the communication processes and techniques. The

²⁰ *KWIC Index of NCSW Publications*, Information Service Monographs, Vol. I (Columbus, Ohio: National Conference on Social Welfare, 1965).

NCSW publications contain 322 manuscripts from the period 1874-1960 that were coded for "Communications"—approximately 5 percent of the manuscripts (6,678) published during those years:

<i>Years</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>
1874-80	0	0.0
1881-90	5	1.6
1891-1900	5	1.6
1901-10	26	8.1
1911-20	33	10.2
1921-30	126	39.1
1931-40	59	18.3
1941-50	35	10.9
1951-60	33	10.2
Grand Total	322	100.0

It will be noted that the peak period was 1921-30 when 126, or 39.1 percent of the communications manuscripts were printed. There has been a sharp decline since 1930. Only six manuscripts on communications were included in the NCSW publications from 1961 to 1966.

An analysis of NCSW press clippings from the 1967 Annual Forum shows extensive coverage. In all, there were 366 newspaper clippings from newspapers in 31 states. These stories were written by fifteen reporters who represented community newspapers and the wire services. While these results were gratifying, we should recognize that they indicate only partial coverage of the United States. There are 1,719 newspapers published daily, 9,300 weeklies, and at least 3,000 magazines.²¹

The fact is, however, that the NCSW structure has no device for handling communication with the public in more than fortuitous ways. As long as press coverage at the Annual Forum and state conferences begins only a few weeks before the event, and ends promptly at the last session, it is doubtful that success in this realm can ever amount to more than smooth public relations. Contrarily, if society ultimately expands its public information

²¹ Paul M. Lewis, "Mass Communications Retrieval," *Association Management*, April, 1965, p. 14.

orientation, then conference press coverage will come to be seen as only a part of a broader and more profound program within social welfare.

WHAT CAN WE DO TOGETHER?

Many attempts have been made to organize a common effort at the national level to interpret social welfare to the public. We now have many individual public education programs. An analysis of the National Budget and Consultation Committee's reports for 1968 disclosed that twenty-three of the thirty agencies reported \$19.0 million for their 1967 program budget and \$2.3 million for public education, or 12.2 percent of their total program budget.²²

The NCSW Committee on Public Relations and Development has made a recommendation to the *Ad hoc* Committee on National Interorganizational Relationships to consider this problem at the earliest time. A specific proposal from a qualified national public relations firm is available for review and action. The *ad hoc* committee has still another proposal on its agenda—an international network of specialized information centers.²³

It is clear that the use of technical and professional social welfare knowledge will depend more and more upon the development of a simple intercommunicating network of cooperating, specialized information centers. These centers, under the auspices of national, federal, and state organizations, will contain large collections of documents on a wide variety of social problems and programs. In addition, technical and professional staffs will be available for consultation and assistance. It is proposed that this structure, national or international in scope, and made up of highly autonomous units, will be based on current resources, and will provide for a manuscript from the time it leaves the author's hands until it reaches the user.

In addition to the proposed project on interpretation of social welfare to the public, the NCSW Committee on Public Relations

²² National Budget and Consultation Committee, *Reports for 1968* (New York: the Committee, 1967).

²³ Joe R. Hoffer, *Toward an International Social Welfare Information and Document Retrieval System* (Columbus, Ohio: National Conference on Social Welfare, 1966).

and Development and the National Board have approved a broad-gauged program to celebrate the centennial anniversary of the NCSW in 1973. It is proposed that the centennial program combine the past, present, and future aspects of social welfare and that a public relations stance be its central core. To accomplish these objectives, we will call upon the major state, national, and international organizations to join forces in planning, organizing, and conducting the centennial anniversary program, beginning June 1, 1972.

With these three communication proposals—interpretation of social welfare to the public, an international network of specialized information centers, and the NCSW centennial anniversary—the *ad hoc* committee has some unfinished business in its original assignment, namely, the problem of multiple conferences in social welfare. In its preliminary consideration of this problem, the *ad hoc* committee agreed that consideration of multiple conferences in the social welfare field should be deferred until some of the more basic problems of interrelationships between and among national organizations are considered.

In our examination of the communication systems in social welfare we must be aware that social welfare operates primarily within the social system. The other principal systems with which it is associated can be identified as the education system, the communication system, and the political system, all of which overlap and are interdependent and interrelated. In addition, there are two subsystems within the social welfare system: the social agency system and the forum system.

Each agency represented on the *ad hoc* committee operates as a subsystem within the social welfare system and each has a relationship to the social agency, the education, the communication, and the political systems. They also carry major responsibilities for forums, planning, action, and interchange of information. A proposal has been made that several cooperative coalitions, alliances, and working relationships be mounted within the next five years between and among the participants in the *ad hoc* committee since each organization has mutual memberships, interests, and objectives. The NCSW is already committed to work-

ing with one or all of these bodies, and they are represented presently on the NCSW Committee on Program.

The communication systems in social welfare can be strengthened considerably if special studies are undertaken to determine the most effective methods of improving the present vertical and horizontal communication systems. A mechanism now exists in the *Ad hoc* Committee on National Interrelationships in Social Welfare composed of representatives of the so-called "umbrella" national organizations to realize the full potential of the several million dollars being spent for public education today. Specific draft proposals, including the need for broader administrative backing and financial support, have been formulated for immediate consideration. These include:

1. A proposal for a public relations program for social welfare
2. An international network of specialized information centers
3. NCSW centennial program, 1973
4. Large conferences in social welfare.

If we lack an adequate definition of social welfare, let us consider a definition of science, which identifies it totally with its documentary output: "Science is that which is published in scientific journals, papers, reports and books."²⁴ In short, it is that which is embodied in the literature.

Steps should be taken to develop a coordinated and unified system of information storage and retrieval. New methods based on modern computer techniques are essential. At the moment, in many specializations, new publications accumulate so fast that practitioners are not made rapidly aware of much of the published information bearing on their work, and there is a resultant duplication of effort in research, writing, and discussion. The matter is urgent because different systems are being established in different disciplines which are not compatible with one another. It is to be emphasized that the proposed coordinated world-wide system would require the active participation of social welfare practitioners on a broad scale. Appropriate studies should be initiated without delay by the appropriate bodies.

²⁴ D. J. deSolla Price, "The Science of Science," *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, XXI, No. 1 (1965), 8.

The problems of communications, be they vertical or horizontal, may not appear to be the most crucial problems we face. However, if we could find some solutions to them, our task in making our contribution to solving basic social problems would be greatly enhanced. We have the tools; all we need to do is to use them.

Perceptions of Social Development at Home and Abroad

by RUBY B. PERNELL

LIKE EVERYONE ELSE, I am intrigued by certain aspects of the phenomena of change with which we are living today. The world's socioeconomic situation has taken on the characteristics of a rubber band which, pulled at each end, stretches the ends further apart but pulls the sides closer together, exerting stress on the whole ring toward the outward limits of endurance. That is to say, while the economic gaps between the haves and have-nots of the world have grown wider, we have been drawing closer toward each other in our social problems. What is stretching is our tolerance for enduring the tensions so induced; and while some are pulling at the band to break it, others are frantically searching for ways of easing the strain, and still others are putting fingers in their ears hoping that if they do not hear the pop when the band breaks, everything will still be the same. The "one-world" concept is increasingly applicable, not only as a politicosocial value, but as a socioeconomic fact.

For some time we have recognized the fact that we are all tied together in complex and interdependent relationships. Military, political, and economic alliances have reflected common concerns, common friends, and common enemies. Our world relationships have hitherto been based on a power concept in which economic and military strength played the major part. Our perceptions and categories of nations have been as "rich" or "poor," "strong" or "weak," economically developed or "developing" or "less-developed," aid-giving nations or dependent ones. Each of these perceptions has inferior-superior connotations, and in each the

United States has been in the dominant category. In addition to our recognized military and economic strength, we have also held a position of moral leadership, preaching a gospel of individual freedom, democratic government, and world order. Many of our own problems have been hidden even from ourselves.

It is only in the last few years that our position has begun to alter. Our military strategies and technical know-how have not easily prevailed against guerrilla warfare in the jungle. The dominance of the dollar in international finance has been severely threatened, and the morality of our military actions on the world front and our social and economic system on the home front has been open to serious question.

It is only in the past few years that we have had to face the fact that hidden under our affluence lay great social and economic problems similar to those we were trying to help solve abroad. We knew about poverty and hunger in India. We have only recently discovered it at home. We knew that Latin American, Indonesian, and other students were a political and social force to be reckoned with, but we did not know that the same thing could happen at home. We could protest racial practices in South Africa or Southern Rhodesia while comforting ourselves that we were making great strides toward integration at home. We knew that "the establishment" in other countries needed overhauling, that university education and administration were not in tune with the times or with the needs in their countries, but we thought we were the models. These social discoveries have atomic force in them, and as the action develops, the threat and the promise both lie within. There is no longer need to ask, "Where's the action?" It is everywhere, and we are all actors in it, playing out some vast sociodrama in which roles with which we have had little experience must be improvised as responses to the fast-shifting scene.

The action centers on social and economic concerns, is infused by political motives and actions, and pregnant with moral questions. The target is the *status quo* and the establishment in whatever form it represents active or latent power. The battlegrounds

are the self, the homes, the streets, the universities, the press, the political and legal hallways, or any other convenient arena where one can stage a fight. The weapons range from firebombs to verbal invective, to agonizing self-appraisal, to flowers, to passive resistance, to withdrawal. Not even God, Country, or Mother has been immune from attack. "God" is having to withstand the searching query of "Is He dead?" and "country" has been threatened by draft card burnings and defections to other countries. Even "motherhood" is out of fashion in the world's newly developed anxiety about population control and Congressional restrictions of AFDC.

However, it is not my intention to embark on a lengthy analysis of these phenomena. My main concern here is with the context within which social work must operate and change too. For me, the most salient points of commonality to emerge from a worldwide scanning of the action are: (1) the challenge is coming from the young in age and in national identity who have been brought up on a philosophy of liberalism, democracy, freedom, self-direction, and humanitarianism (even when its application has been denied them), who have become impatient with what they consider the inept fumbblings of those who presently hold the power, and who now want to influence the action themselves; (2) the action has highlighted the need of millions of the world's people for an adequate economic base in order to sustain individual and national life and personal and national identity; and (3) the powerful of the world are being challenged, for their own ultimate survival, to provide a full measure of social justice and human dignity for the underdogs of the world, in keeping with the liberal and humanitarian values which have nourished their hopes so long.

These liberal values have proved to be traps, catching their long-time proponents in crises of conscience as they prove unworkable on a partial basis. The present color crises, particularly in England and America, have brought the prejudices and the partial commitments out of hiding, and we stand face to face on basic issues of who shall survive, and on what terms.

In terms of world efforts for planned change, the 1960s are

considered the "development decade." In view of the unplanned efforts for change, I would consider a better name "the decade of the underdog" when, like so many erstwhile sleeping giants, peoples have awakened, and now, struggling to rise from the myriad threads which have held them down, are breaking their bonds and aggressively demanding to stand in their own dignity and with rights equal to those formerly accorded only to their masters. In the words of an old spiritual, they expect "to sit at the welcome table one of these days." The struggle is essentially moral, but it is expressed in the act of sharing or withholding. The urgent tasks are development and reconciliation.

Important action for development has been going on at the international level since the Marshall Plan set the pattern. Western European nations, rising out of the holocaust of the Second World War, were faced only with the task of *redevelopment*, having both the structures and the experience to make quick use of the aid extended them, by the United States—for purposes and with methods acceptable and understandable to the aid-giver. The less-developed countries, however, which have been receiving economic aid in the ensuing years, have had a development task, slowed down by their own historical, political, social, and economic circumstances, with methods, pacing, and selection of goals often at variance with those of the donor.

In the last several years there has been a proliferation of international aid organizations, both governmental and voluntary, offering everything from capital loans and financial advice to assistance given by poorly prepared volunteers. This activity is partly due to a sense of responsibility on the part of the developed nations for helping the less developed, but also to political motives which are not always necessarily reprehensible. For example, a great deal of the aid is predicated on the idea that an economically strong nation with productive capacity enough to feed, employ, and satisfy the consumer needs of its own people is less likely to contribute to the world's political instability than one which lacks this capacity.

Altruistic or political, one of the unfortunate concomitants of economic aid on the international as well as on the home front

has been the implications of dependency and the donor's reservation of rights to some control over the gift. This control has generally been benign, aimed at assuring what the giver believes to be the best use of the money, material, or manpower. However, "the relation of the human planner to the human planned-for has, inevitably, elements of the relation between shepherd and sheep."¹

In addition to the implication of superiority in the "father knows best" practice of giving economic assistance, there is also, as every social worker knows, the generation of hostility in the breast of the receiver, born out of his own dependency on the giver. This hostility is compounded by merging with the long-standing grievances of having been exploited in the past and reduced to the present state of dependency. When more aid is demanded, the response may be niggardly or lavish, dependent on such factors as the donor nation's agricultural surpluses or general political climate or the momentary importance (to the donor) of a given program.

To the surprise and frustration of the generous donor, today's recipient nations and groups often take what seem to be self-defeating positions of refusing to accept economic assistance unless it is given on their own terms. Although this refusal may, by objective standards, be shortsighted and costly in economic development, it is the price the would-be recipient is willing to pay for the opportunity of asserting his pride and independence.

Thus, a new meaning of "social aspects" has been added to economic planning and development; for not only must we be concerned with social infrastructure, manpower development for increased production, population control, and similar "social" programs tolerated by the economic planners, but there must also be concern for what might be called the sociopersonal, as distinct from the socioeconomic, factor. That is, what a man feels as a man, his sense of self and his group identification must increasingly be reckoned with, not only in his use of assistance, but in his response to the offer. Building an economy has been

¹ Crane Brinton, *A History of Western Morals* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1959).

proved by our own national experience consecutively with slavery, industrialization and technocracy to be an inadequate way to build a democratic nation which is to endure. It is only when building the economy is coupled with planned and continuing efforts to build a society which is fully—not partially—committed to democratic values and practices that we can hope for realization of the American dream for ourselves or others. Among the countries which have received massive assistance from the United States is India, which has often been referred to as representing a great experiment in democracy. It has been our policy to assist her because we want her to succeed. America is also a great experiment in democracy, beset by some of the same problems of underdevelopment, poverty and hunger, caste-ism, student unrest, contentions for political power, and growing urban ills. We must come to our own aid quickly if we hope to endure. The lessons learned on the international front should be applied at home; and those learned at home, now that our social common denominators have been revealed, should have meaning for our international activities.

Today's world is a "natural" for social work. We have the poor, we have hunger, we have neighborhoods which need changing, we have disadvantaged migrant, ethnic groups, we have intergroup hostility and antisocial elements, people who have more children than they can support (perhaps more than the world can support), and people who are victimized by the circumstances of their birth. We also have many volunteers and professional partners, young people looking for responsibility; and, most wonderfully, we have the self-help instinct, the strengthened egos, the readiness for change, responsive, supporting, cooperating community groups, new resources, and more money to work with—all of which were little more than a dream a short ten years ago.

Working for the poor, the dispossessed, the displaced, and the downtrodden has always been the special province of social work, undisputed until recently with anyone other than an occasional politician or economic ideologist. Over the years, however, social work, influenced by theoretical developments in the field of individual psychology and professional status considerations, grad-

ually turned away from the poor, pivoting toward a middle-class, verbal clientele; and, while admitting group work and community organization to the fellowship, kept casework as the core of the profession, often making it synonymous with social work. Group work, striving for recognition of its legitimacy, turned more and more to focus on the individual in the group, on his maladjustments as the *raison d'être* for the group, and on the use of the group to help him and his fellow members. The early definitions of social group work which put emphasis not only on the help the individual received through the group, but also on the group as an instrument for social good have been discarded by many. Work with so-called "normal groups" has been questionable as a "professional activity." It is no wonder that someone has felt it necessary to invent the term "community group work" to connote a service or method thought to be new.

Concomitantly during the years just past, systematic attempts have been made to separate the professionally qualified from the unqualified, and to reserve functions for the qualified, putting serious limitations on the numbers who could be so served and the variations in services which could be offered. New clinical services have attracted the professional, and the hard, often unrewarding work with generalized caseloads of poor people has been too often left with the least qualified.

Fortunately, these comments apply to what I hope is becoming history, as social work is challenged to change. I do not wish to seem to blame social work for its own history. I believe that it is no different from, nor worse than, any other profession in following the influences of new thought, carrying out specialized functions, restricting membership, and striving for status. Each idea seems to have its time of prominence, overshadowing lesser trends of thought and practice that coexist with it. Throughout the time that group work, for example, was becoming increasingly focused on services to special groups, professional group workers were still plugging away in settlements and neighborhood centers, trying to get ordinary, "normal" people to work together on some matter of community concern.

It was perhaps unfortunate that the export of American pro-

fessional social work gained its momentum and popularity abroad during the 1950s when we were so firmly committed to an individual approach and a method-centered curriculum. Schools of social work in developing countries were organized in patterns similar to our own, although ours were designed for an urbanized, specialized, method-based product, indigenous to our own society, while their context was one of a largely rural population, generalized and massive socioeconomic needs, and a need for trained manpower to staff their development services. This is not to say that social work education has not been relevant; it just has not been relevant enough to the socioeconomic situation within which it had to operate. Each country has its special urban problems that can be treated by American methods, and so our export brand has worked in less-developed countries, and the professional social workers, like their counterparts in America, have preferred the cities to the villages, trying to develop specialized urban services, placing security, income, and status above what might be called "sacrificial service," and making earnest attempts to achieve recognition as distinct from the many nontrained workers in the field.

Professional social work is trying to move more into some of the developmental services in these countries, although the progress is slow for a number of reasons. The important point is that many of the social work leaders in developing countries have come to the conclusion that their social work education and social work services need to be more pertinent to the conditions and needs within their own countries. The International Council on Social Welfare's Asian Regional Seminar on Social Welfare Manpower held in Tokyo in 1967 stressed this point and questioned the American pattern which most educators and professional workers were following.²

One of the most interesting facets of this Tokyo discussion was its reflection of the time lag. When we became most active in exporting American social work education, sending consultants abroad and educating foreign social workers here, we were pro-

² Report of the Asian Regional Seminar on Social Welfare Manpower, International Council on Social Welfare, Tokyo, 1967.

jecting our post-Second World War view of social work as appropriate to the world's social welfare problems. This view overlooked a host of needs which have been spotlighted by the attention to development planning in the last decade.

Now social work in America is in the "social revolution era." We have become aware of our own problems, so similar to those of developing countries. We are more consciously akin to their needs and are instituting for ourselves more appropriate and transferable services than ever before. But now, those social workers abroad who have been ahead of their time in their own countries are behind the times in their conception of the rapidly changing American social work scene.

It seems ridiculous to us that a near-destitute woman in a city of India, seeking help from a family agency, might be rated uncooperative and go unserved because she will not discuss with the caseworker the psychological implications of her situation. It seems inappropriate to many more of us now than it would have a few years ago before we rediscovered poverty and hunger in the midst of our affluent, "developed" society. In less-developed countries, the affluence has existed in the midst of poverty. In both cases, the distances have grown wider between those who have and those who have not, and the poverty has gone unseen either because it was hidden or because it was too common to register on the sight.

The same thing has been true for injustice, that companion of poverty. As contact and communication gaps have widened, it has been more difficult for those on top to be aware of the problems of those below. The tokenism in race relations, the coin to the beggar, takes care of the problem until the next time. Thus, poverty and injustice have proceeded hand in hand, waiting to be revealed to us once again.

In the history of social work, working with poverty and injustice has yielded some of the greatest social rewards. The awareness of poverty and injustice from time to time casts up social reformers who make lasting marks on history. This was true with Jane Addams and the settlement movement in America. For social work, and especially group work, this was an event of ut-

most importance, occurring at a time that was in many ways similar to our own.

Henry Steele Commager, in the Forward to *Twenty Years at Hull House*, says:

The time was ripe and the place logical. By 1890, just a hundred years after the founding of the Republic, the "Promise of American Life" was becoming an illusion. The extremes of wealth and poverty were as great as those in the Old World. Millions of immigrants crowded into the slums of American cities, constituting a proletariat not only impoverished, but alien: these newcomers were the first immigrants who had not been absorbed. The Negro had achieved his freedom, but as yet not acceptance or recognition. . . . The welfare state was as yet unknown and almost unimagined; even social legislation was a thing of the future.

As Miss Addams saw it, there was nothing dramatic about the opening of Hull House; yet it was a historic event. For here was the beginning of what was to be one of the great social movements in modern America—the Settlement House movement; here, in a way, was the beginning of social work. As yet there was no organized social work in the United States . . . as yet there was not even any formal study of sociology.³

In summing up the activities of Miss Addams and her Hull House associates, Commager tells us:

Very early [they] found that they had to move into the political arena. They helped push through labor legislation, set up Juvenile Courts, provided school playgrounds, worked for adequate enforcement of housing and sanitation laws, improved the school system, agitated for broader participation in politics—including woman suffrage—called for legal protection for immigrants, [and] served as an embryonic Civil Liberties Union to preserve due process.⁴

Now, more than half a century later, though much that the early settlement workers fought for has been accomplished and social work has moved on, the poor and despised are still with us, migrants crowd into urban slums, new social legislation is needed, there is "misgovernment, exploitation and the inhumanity of man to man."

Perhaps this is what the young social work activists are saying:

³ Jane Addams, *Twenty Years at Hull House* (New York: New American Library, 1961), p. lx.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. xiv.

that the institutionalization, professionalization, and specialization of social work over the years have robbed us of our vitality and our penchant for direct creative engagement with the most pressing problems of our times, and that perhaps we need to start out fresh again. The institutionalization, professionalization and specialization have, to an extent, but certainly not completely, separated the "social reformer" from the "social worker." There is a wave of interest in social reform. Caught up in this, the students and young workers, unlike those of the immediate past, want to reintegrate the reformer element as a dominant part of the social work identity.

There is a tendency today, when the initiative has been taken into the hands of the young, to a disbelief that anything done in "the olden days" was right in action or motive. And yet, my point in referring to the settlement movement is that within our own history we have the experience and the traditions that can count today. We were in this business of social reform when nobody else cared, gathering facts, encouraging self-help action groups, lobbying for social legislation, harrying local government about slum conditions, organizing tenants' councils, opposing entrenched power, and generally trying to make the American dream come true for everyone.

What has changed is a whole social climate in which the impulse to be part of a compelling social movement has been stirred in the breasts of all who care about people. Social workers who grew up in the 1930s, who were students then, who volunteered their services to social agencies, deplored in the late 1950s the fact that the students of that period had never known the depression, the hopelessness, disillusionment, and destitution, the shanty towns and apple sellers of those years; had never felt the stir to action, never expressed radical thoughts, nor boycotted silk stockings. They were bent on getting ahead, and if one talked about volunteering, they wanted to know how much would it pay!

The social ferment in America today owes most to Dr. Martin Luther King, for he introduced a direct-action concept to America in which a disciplined use of self ("self-power") conjointly with others could be used to change powerful, entrenched in-

stitutions. He brought injustice out of hiding, reenergized the whole civil rights movement, and taught heretofore little men that they could be giants. The climate this created is conducive to further social reform efforts, for people catch a vision of the possibilities and are moved toward having a hand in it all.

The Gandhian movement, from which Dr. King took his cue, also produced—and attracted—social reformers. Out of that movement came a nonprofessional social worker called the “constructive worker.” The workers derived their name from their mission, which was the social reconstruction of the country. Social and economic inequalities were their targets, and they launched themselves into activities to remove caste barriers and to bring about economic betterment.

A wholistic approach to social problems, the constructive work recognizes that the various facets and aspects of social problems and realities cannot be separated from each other and faced in an isolated manner. The aim of constructive work is thus to bring in a total process of change by generating will and strength in the people themselves. Gandhian concern is, therefore, in the immediate steps to be taken here and now and not only with the ultimate ushering in of an ideal society. [They were concerned] with education of the masses, an effort to arouse the innate capacities of the people which will enable them to realize the full strength of their being and thereby to regulate and control power and authority instead of looking upon the latter as the source of all support and services. . . . The activities chosen in the constructive work program seek to strengthen the will of the people and lead to a non-violent and satisfying social order. . . . A conviction about the need for bringing in social change and respect for the common man provide the two basic inspirations for the constructive worker.⁵

In the past few years, a dialogue has been going on in India between the constructive workers and professional social workers, to explore their basic similarities and differences. From an interim report:

Professional social work, it may *prima facie* appear, is mainly interested in dealing with specific schemes of social welfare which can

⁵ S. Dasgupta, ed., “Gandhian Constructive Work and Professional Social Work in India—Interim Report of a Working Group,” *Social Science Abstracts*, II (1965), 237-38.

help in reducing maladjustments of the individuals in the context of the prevailing set up, rather than dealing with various stages of social processes and in developing, along with ameliorative services, the preventive and constructive as well.⁶

The professional worker in India, at present, is not at all sure that he has any responsibility for social action. The constructive social worker, on the other hand, characterizes his work as social action and sees his goals as revolutionary.

This little synopsis of the professional social worker's view of social work, although a generalization, illustrates what can happen when the American model of social work is fitted into the Asian scene. It is a much more stark model than ours, and I must defend it at least by saying that some professional workers do not limit their view so much, nor is the attitude unknown among American professionals.

Whether we consider ourselves social reformers, constructive workers, or social workers, our reawakening to the problems of poverty and injustice calls us all to action. In the jargon of the mid-1960s, to be "part of the action" is to be significantly involved in the social change movements of the day. Perhaps the observations I have been making on social trends and developments at home and abroad may have some usefulness in guiding or assessing social work's own part in "the action."

To pull together the strings I have been dangling, to find out whether it is possible to come to any conclusions, I would say first of all that the "action" is good if it will make us examine where our commitments lie and restore to a place of honor our old and original commitment to the poor and disadvantaged.

The "action" is good if, instead of turning wholly to new gods for the answers to present-day problems, we examine our own accumulated experience and knowledge and values as social workers to find the pertinent answers. "Black is beautiful" is a current phrase of the Black Nationalist movement. Social work is beautiful too, and also must learn to value itself in terms of its origins and historical contributions. As with blacks, its value cannot be defined only in terms of its middle-class activities.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 239.

The "action" is good if it teaches us that what we thought was an excellent model for social work education and practice has proved to be too limited a concept to meet major problems in developing countries, including our own. The American brand of professional social work still sets the pace and pattern throughout a good part of the world. The sooner we make significant changes better to serve the economically and socially deprived, especially as they awake from apathy, the better position we shall be in to offer our help abroad.

As the action shifts more and more to the developmental needs of a society, does social work education need to shift too? Perhaps we ought to examine whether curriculum can only be organized around methods or settings. Can it be organized around services? For example, in a developing country it might be possible to organize curriculum into two major sections: one, developmental services, embracing the variety of enabling, educational, and action services—the "constructive" activities, to use the Gandhian term; the other section, protective and therapeutic services. This might also serve as an experimental model here too.

I have long thought that contrary to the traditional organization of schools of social work around a casework core, the group was really the central concept, with work with the individual and the community appearing as one moves along a continuum in one direction or the other. I feel now more strongly than ever that much that social work requires today lies within the traditions, skills, and knowledge of social group work, and particularly those of the settlement movement. The group worker's experience with democratic processes in groups, with youth, with volunteers and program specialists, and with program itself, is all pertinent today. This is not to say that casework is dead. It is needed now as ever, but our own and the world's problems show that it cannot dominate social work if we are to keep in step with other demands of our times. Methods have been overlapping for a long time; perhaps curriculum organization around services may give us a really new approach. For example, curriculum organization on the model suggested earlier might have the group approach as the core method, while the individual approach might be the

core method for protective and therapeutic services. In each area the variations of method for work with individual, group, or community could have appropriate emphasis.

Finally, the "action" is good if it can move us into more acceptance of, and integration with, those whose activities supplement, complement, and sometimes overlap our own. The professional social worker and the Gandhian constructive worker are an important and necessary team with so much to learn from each other that some day each may *be* something of the other. The catalytic effect of the brash young volunteer, the many direct services of the nonprofessional paid worker, the vision and drive of the social reformer, and the analysis and skill in human relationships of the professional worker, together add up to social work. When all of these are found in one person, it is enough to gladden the spirit; otherwise, we must be able to make the services of all into one integrated service to those who need our help.

Today, when confrontation seemingly must happen before it is possible to get down to business, let us not waste time on confrontation for its own sake, while poor, disadvantaged people wait for services they want and need immediately. Let us, instead, confront the *problems* we face rather than each other; young with old, professional with lay, social workers with community leaders, to get on with the work at hand. There is much to be done.

Reason and Responsibility in the Elimination of Bigotry and Poverty

by WHITNEY M. YOUNG, JR.

THE UNFINISHED TASK of making real the dream of justice and equality for all calls us from our comfortable complacency, our insensitivity, our indifference. That task beckons with the finger of urgency to involvement, to participation, and to the realization of the dream. Tempted as we are to take the wings of a dove and fly away to be at rest, we may get away from a little of it, but we cannot get away from it all. The suburbs are not far enough. The skyscrapers are not high enough. The clubs are not exclusive enough. The world is not big enough. We are part and parcel of the problem. This, to me, is terribly important.

In many ways this has been an unprecedented Forum. I am frankly quite proud of the Conference. I think it would have been to the everlasting shame of social work and its practitioners if we had met at this moment in history—at the time of the nation's greatest moral crises, at a time when it faces its greatest challenge to its historic promises—if we had met and conducted our business as usual in a cocoon of indifference.

But, it would be equally naïve, if not disastrous, for us not to recognize that what was reflected here was far more than a challenge to the National Conference on Social Welfare. I read into the challenges, into the demands, and into the unprecedented actions and concerns of the large numbers of delegates at this Forum a challenge to the whole system and institution of social welfare, to each and every one of its agencies, to each individual social worker, administrator, teacher, practitioner, and citizen.

Arnold Toynbee observed sometime ago "that civilization is a movement, not a condition. It is a voyage, not a harbor." In his monumental work, *Self-Renewal*, John W. Gardner states:

. . . when organizations are in the beginning years they have great flexibility and are willing to try anything once. As the organization ages, vitality diminishes, flexibility gives away to rigidity, and there is a loss of capacity to meet unexpected challenge. The only way for an organization to survive is through continuing self-renewal and innovation. Recognition of the need for renewal is not enough, but an organization must have the structural arrangements that make orderly renewal a possibility. . . . the ever-renewing organization is not one which is convinced that it endures eternal youth. It knows it is forever growing old and must do something about it. It knows that it is always producing "dead wood" and must for that reason attend to its "seed beds."¹

The "seed beds" are new ideas. New ways of doing things. New approaches. An aging society loses its adaptiveness and stifles creativity in its members. In an ever-renewing organization what matures is a system or a framework within which continuous innovation, renewal, and rebirth can occur. I think we are somehow prepared for this by words of that great philosopher, Pogo, who said, "We have met the enemy and he is us."

But remember that self-renewal depends on motivation, depends on commitment and conviction. As one editor put it, "to change is always difficult but not to change is inevitably fatal." The winds of change in this country and around the world are reaching tornado proportions. The poor, the disinherited, the disadvantaged, the nameless, the faceless are saying in no unmistakable language that they are completely aware of the gap between their status in life and the status of the large majority of people, particularly those in the Western world.

Furthermore, they are indicating not only that they are aware of their conditions but that they are aware of the causes of those conditions, that those conditions are not God-decreed or constitutional—those conditions are man-made, not God-made. They recognize that there is nothing innate or congenital about them

¹ John W. Gardner, *Self-Renewal: the Individual and the Innovative Society* (New York: Harper & Row, 1964).

as human beings that makes inevitable the tragic day-to-day mid-night which they experience.

Furthermore, this large group of disinherited, around the world and in our own country, are not only insisting on change, they are determined to participate in that change process, and in fact, to have a role in the shaping of their own destiny.

They are reinforced today not just by growing numbers of those like themselves but, almost without exception, by the young. The youth of our society have become real allies and will increasingly become the allies of that large mass of the disinherited. It would be foolhardy to assume that when I say the youth of the world I am speaking of only the more dramatic, the stereotyped "hippie." I am talking about the large masses of young people. Whether they wear beads and flowers or not, this is a strong concern which all express. I assure you that social work institutions are not immune to confrontation. It is inevitable.

Any social work institution that feels that the confrontation is a phenomenon only of Columbia, or Berkeley, or the educational institutions generally is being terribly naïve. We can either make the confrontation a creative and a constructive one by helping to initiate it, or we can make it more volatile and destructive by awaiting it, postponing it, or if we are foolish enough to do so, resisting it.

Frequently in this conference we have cited the Kerner Commission Report on Civil Disorders. We have used it as we should have—as an authentic document prepared by an expert staff ranging all the way from reactionaries to liberals. I do not think there were any extreme liberals on the Commission, but it was a representative cross section of important people. And we have cited from time to time their documentation of the causes of civil disorder, namely, the persuasive gap in the social, economic, living, housing, and health conditions of at least 20 percent of our citizens. We have pointed out not only its documentation of the nature of the problem and the extent to which it exists but also what members of the Commission perceived as the basic causes and the best solutions. Frequently at the Conference while

people have been willing to accept the documentation as it relates to poverty gaps and gaps in income and have even been willing to go along with the proposed solutions as they relate to a massive approach—what we in the Urban League four years ago called “the Domestic Marshall Plan”—there has been less enthusiasm and some reluctance to give equal credibility to what the Commission calls the major causal factor, and that is white racism. I can understand the reluctance of large groups of people here to accept it. I urge that you relax, that you understand what is meant by the term. In understanding it, you will be prepared to accept it as valid. White racism does not mean that white people are straining at the leash to hang all black people on a high tree or even to buy them a one-way ticket to Africa.

White racism does not imply the vulgar, crude, vile, obscene kind of bigotry characterized by the Klan, by the White Citizens Council. White racism means that the large majority of white people in this country do, in fact, believe deep down inside in a concept of white superiority.

Given the history of race relations in this country—250 or more years of enslavement of a people because of their color; another 100 years of technical or quasi-legal freedom, a type of rigid separation and exclusion which was reinforced and confirmed by law and which was only removed, and not all of it then, in 1964; a society that believed itself to be a democratic society committed to the Judeo-Christian ethic, despite clear evidence to the contrary—the assumption of white superiority cannot be avoided.

One could no more live in a leper colony and not get leprosy than live in a society which practiced the forced exclusion of people on the basis of race and not become a nation of schizophrenics.

The lack of opportunity for peer relationships; the stereotyped projection of black people throughout history; the lack of inclusion of black people in a dignified and correct place in history could not help but create this situation. Unless we can acknowledge it, acknowledge that it is a sickness, without getting defensive about it, we might as well stop talking about trying to change the situation.

We have had, in effect, a social audit of the nation made by the Kerner Commission, and it is in our own enlightened self-interest, if not the interests of survival, to regard it as seriously as if we had had a fiscal audit of the National Conference on Social Welfare and found it almost bankrupt, or a health audit of our own individual persons and found ourselves suffering from tuberculosis. We can ignore the results of this study only with disastrous results.

Another term that has been thrown around the last two years and quite a bit at this Forum is the term "black power." Probably as much as anyone else, I regretted the introduction of this term into our vocabulary, and once it was introduced wished as much as anyone else that it would go away. But it did not go away—it will not go away—and it seems to me that the mature and intelligent individual, therefore, is required to look at it. Does it stay on just because it titillates the adventurous media? Or does it stay on because there is some truth and some basis for it?

I suggest to you that black power need not be viewed as a totally negative concept. In fact, except for a few facetious interpretations of it as a call for violence or a call for separatism I would say that black power as a concept is a very positive one and one that social workers, seeking tools with which they may strengthen the moral and the psychological security of their clients, might well make use of. There is nothing novel in the concept. The only novelty is in the chanting and shouting of it. Throughout history we have seen conscious attempts on the part of those who felt themselves suppressed and in a minority situation to organize their economic and their political strength to reward their friends, to punish their enemies, and to advance the ends of their own ethnic group. The Irish have done it; the Italians have done it; the Jewish people have done it; the Catholics have done it. It is a consistent legitimate type of arrangement in our kind of society. The only difference is that they did not shout, "Jewish power," "Italian power," or "Irish power."

Black power needs to be seen, however, in its most positive light. It is less an assertion of domination, or violence, or a call

for exclusion, than it is a rejection of the results of white power over black people and their communities. Without exception one can document easily the negative consequences of white domination educationally, in housing, economically, and socially. Black power is a cry for dignity. It is a plea for recognition that I am somebody. That I have roots and pride. That I have rights. That I insist upon the opportunity to participate in my destiny, and the destiny of my children and that I want a piece of the action. If I am going to suffer the responsibilities, the horrors, and the dangers of this country, then I insist on enjoying some of the rewards.

It is as simple as that. It is not really a slogan or a concept that should in any way upset us. There are too many white people in this country today who are using the slogan as an excuse to "cop" out, or to become alienated and find their feelings hurt. At the other extreme, there are the ultraliberal white militants who feel that in order to prove their credibility they must be more militant than the most militant Negro, and wind up joining with the white racists, who are saying, "I think it's a pretty good idea to set up black capitalism—to set up a black economic system—to let blacks withdraw into a separate state—even to buy them tickets back to Africa."

I think we ought to put things in perspective so that we talk not just about black power, but "poor power," about the Mexican-Americans in the West and the Southwest, the Indians, the Puerto Ricans, the Appalachian whites. All of these things hold equally true for them, and when I talk about the disinherited, the disadvantaged, I include these groups.

In Harlem the Urban League runs a school called Harlem Prep. We are operating it in a deliberate attempt to embarrass the educational establishment. We are showing them that disadvantaged youngsters are educable. A youngster who reaches the age of five in the slums of Harlem has to be educable; if he survives he has got to be. We are in the process of demonstrating this very successfully.

I was there not so long ago. This is a school that accepts only the dropouts, the dissenters, the disillusioned, those who are in

the most poverty-stricken situations, the angry. One of the young fellows had a kind of dialogue with me, using all the language that is so prevalent today: "We must dominate our community. We must take over everything. We must have all black schools and all black teachers." I said, "How can you say this when right here in this classroom about half of the teachers are white?" There were three Catholic Sisters, and three or four Peace Corps returnees. I said, "Obviously, there is great affection between you. I was watching you just a few minutes ago, and there was great respect and affection between you and one of the white teachers." The youngster said, "Oh, Mr. Young, she ain't white—she's nice."

You see, this is what I mean by separating the symbols from the substance. "White," in that youngster's mind, and in the minds of literally thousands of young black people, is a description of behavior.

I followed this up by saying, "Well, what about the man who murdered Malcolm X or the fellow who just killed Roy Innis's son?" He said, "They were white." But actually they were black people. This further confirmed what I suspected, that what he was describing was behavior. In his mind and in his experience contact with certain white people in the community who represented authority—the police, the shopkeepers, the landlords—had all too often been negative, had made bad behavior "white." It made a person who was nice, not really "white."

There has been a great deal of discussion about the Poor People's March. And again, this is an appropriate concern, although it is a sad commentary on this country that poor people should have to march. It is a well-known fact that Congress has vacillated, has acted irresponsibly if not criminally, in view of the dimensions of the problems and the mood of the times. Any kind of intelligent assessment of priorities in a civilized society would put poverty and the crisis in our cities at the top.

There is no question about the need to do several things. It is often suggested that we can do a study. I have declared a moratorium on all studies of black people. No more studies! But I am not anti-intellectual, so I suggested that we throw our resources

into the study of white people, with Congress as one of the groups I want to look at.

Instead of another study on the pathology of the Negro family, we would like to do one on the pathology of Congress. What is the matter with the Congress? What are the problems of people who will sit on their hands while the President in his State of the Union Message asks to save black bodies in the ghetto, and then applaud loudly when he talks about saving redwood trees in California? That is precisely what happened. Something is also wrong with a Congress that will respond to riots by quickly passing an appropriation for the National Guard and the next day shouting down a bill to get rid of rats in the homes of human beings.

This does not make sense, and so we need to study Congress. It is a sad commentary that poor people should be wallowing in the mud at Resurrection City, catching pneumonia, but they have no choice, because the rich will not march. Congress refuses to march to the poor and so there is no choice left for the poor.

I think the time has come when black people have a perfect right to say, "Why should we carry the responsibility for purifying America?" Civil rights is something that every American ought to be concerned about, and the people who ought to be the most concerned are the people who have enjoyed the rich promise of America the most. They are the ones who have the greatest stake in making the American dream a reality.

Why should white people always ride on the moral coattails of the Negro? Why cannot white people stand up and say, "*This* is my problem. I'm a leader for civil rights."? In the absence of this, poor people have to march to Washington.

It is not unprecedented in history.

Now one final observation. There has been a great deal of discussion about law and order. Since this is an election year it is important to point out that we are slowly but very subtly being presented with a whole new racial code. A bunch of code phrases has taken the place of more overt racial statements. Phrases such as, "law and order," "crime in the streets," "your home is your castle," "neighborhood schools."

Now, "crime in the streets," so far as I am concerned, is a serious problem—if we are talking about the same kind of crime. I am talking about the crime that continues, of the rich white syndicate bosses who control the dope traffic, the prostitution rings, the numbers racket in the ghettos, and who are responsible for 50 percent of urban crime. I am concerned about those criminals who charge people 50 percent more rent for less housing because they know they are trapped in South Side Chicago and cannot move to Cicero; about the crime of overcharging interest so that people end up spending \$500 for a \$175 television set; the crime of not hiring a qualified man because he is black; the crime of not letting a man live next door because of the color of his skin. That is the kind of crime I am concerned about.

I am afraid that what is happening in this country is that the term "crime in the streets" is more and more implying that we are going to suppress, to control, to put in concentration camps, if need be, the rioters. And that is what such people mean when they say it; they do not go on and talk about other crimes.

"Law and order"—let us put it in perspective. That is another favorite cliché of some of our politicians today who would try to win some of the backlash vote. We will never have order in this country until we have justice. The best example of order that we have ever had in the history of the world was provided by Adolph Hitler. He had perfect order, with his Gestapo and his storm troopers. He had people goosestepping all over the place, perfect conformity. Nobody dared dissent. There was perfect order. He used that order to kill 14 million human beings—6 million in ovens—in Germany. I am not remotely interested in order at that price. I am interested in justice, and when we have justice in this country we will have order.

Too many people have short memories. We did not have order in the labor movement in this country until workers got a piece of the action, until they got the Wagner Act, and the chance for union recognition. The women were not orderly until they got suffrage. Our memories are very short.

The cry for "neighborhood schools" is meaningless, since large percentages of urban people already transport their kids

across town to private schools. Those who can afford it send them 300 miles away to private prep schools. "Neighborhood schools" all too often are merely a way of keeping the minority out.

Now what do we do?

First of all, we reaffirm our basic philosophy and belief in the dignity of man and in his right to assistance. In this connection please recognize that the welfare recipient is not unique because he gets a subsidy from the federal government. He is unique because he gets less of a subsidy from the federal government than some 65 percent or 70 percent of all other Americans in our society.

We forget about all the other subsidies that go to people who are home owners—middle-class home owners—through taxes; that go to stimulate business; that go to build airplanes; that go to farmers to keep them from producing; and the subsidies that went to poor white people in 1932 when they were unemployed and rioting. We must reaffirm our basic belief in man's desire to be independent and not to want a handout. Men want to stand on their own two feet!

Where do we begin? In the home, obviously. Right there is where the action begins. Let me tell you one little story on the matter of dignity. There was a time when I could not have told this story to social workers because they were not affluent enough to have maids, but now most of them have a lady who comes in at least one day a week.

When my wife and I lived in Atlanta, we finally reached that point, too. The lady and my wife had a little conference, and they were evidently pleased with each other, and she decided to work for us one day each week.

When she walked into the house she had announced that her name was Carrie. My wife said, "Then what is your last name?" And she said, "Johnson." My wife said, "Thank you, Mrs. Johnson," and they went along with the interview.

When my two children came home from school that afternoon she met them at the door. She said, "Hello, I'm Carrie." My wife came up and said, "Lauren and Marcia, this is Mrs. Johnson." Mrs. Johnson came back to the kitchen and said, "Oh, Mrs.

Young, you don't have to do that. I like to be called Carrie. It makes me feel like I am more a part of the family and closer to the children, so you don't really have to do that."

My wife said, "Mrs. Johnson, this is not done for you. It is done because we do not let our seven- and eight-year-old children call forty-five-year-old women by their first names, and if we don't let them do it for anybody else why should we let them do it for you? We are training our children to respect human beings regardless of the nature of their occupations."

About an hour later the phone rang, and her little son, about five years of age, was on the phone. He inquired, "Is Carrie there?" My wife said, "There is no Carrie here," and hung up. Then she told Mrs. Johnson, "I think it was your son who called. Would you please call him back?" She called him up, and the conversation went like this: "Son, did you call?" He said, "Yes, but the lady said there was no Carrie there." And she said, "Well, Son, you don't have to call me Carrie here—I'm Mrs. Johnson. Here I'm somebody. Call me Mother."

That is just elementary, but that is where it starts if one believes in human dignity. Again, do not get defensive—that is the custom in our society, rationalized because it is a social custom.

Then you begin to teach in your own home by example and not through exhortation. Get the right books early, the books that show all kinds of people in our society and our world, instead of Tom, Dick, and Jane. Publishers now have another kind of story, and they will sell it to you. (Publishers have told us, "If there is a demand we will immediately make the books.")

Teach by your actions in terms of participation in your community, by standing up in church, in your country club, or wherever it might be. These are ways to teach by example.

Now from your home, obviously, you go to the agencies and you do not have to wait until the organization of black social workers comes to tell you—which they will—that you ought to be more integrated. As black people we have the disadvantage of high visibility, and sometimes agencies think that they are more integrated than they really are because of this high visibility. It

looks like more. But it seems to me that if the Boston Celtics can make Bill Russell their manager (and that is like being president of Harvard, since they are the world's champion basketball team), then social work agencies can follow suit. Since they have paved the way, social work agencies can employ black directors in agencies that are predominately white in clientele and in service. Now that is rather revolutionary for social work, but we have the leadership of sports as a precedent. That is the way we may also set the pace for churches—and that will be the day when we will really have arrived.

There is no question about our services. We have to outreach. We have to go into the ghettos. We have to go with heart as well as head. We will be totally irrelevant—totally irrelevant to big business, which supports social work agencies—on the day we are not able to answer them when they ask: "What in the world are you doing to stop all this disorder?" If all you are saying is that you are still treating middle-class kids at these camps and in these handicraft classes or treating middle-class people with neuroses who cannot afford a psychiatrist—if that is all you can demonstrate, then you are in serious trouble. Your agency is in serious trouble. Big business today has gotten the message. They support our agencies. At least, they give us substantial amounts of money, and if you want to be relevant to the community chest, then you had better carve out a major part of your program to identify you with ghetto dwellers.

And your boards ought to be as representative as you can possibly make them. One of the advantages now of having the Association of Black Social Workers is that it will be prepared to give you the names of some new people, not the same old safe ones that you have been taking on.

Finally, please try hard to get away from a preoccupation with the pathologies and the problems. As I said earlier, we have had all the studies we need. We know all of the pathologies. We know all the problems. See if we can spend this year trying to identify the strengths that *are* present in bountiful numbers of people who are without adequate sums of money. Most of the poor are not poor, they are broke—and there is a difference.

My father made \$68.00 a month, with three children, but we were never poor, because he said, "You're a Young! You stand tall, boy! We may be broke, but we're not poor."

It is that kind of pride and that kind of ingenuity that have sustained black people in this country. This is something you ought to build on. Suppose you had to raise a family of four kids now on \$2,500 or \$3,000. You know what white people did in 1929 when the stock market crashed? They jumped off buildings. It takes a certain amount of imagination and strength to survive on the income of the poor. Now try to understand that.

I have mentioned many times the great experience of being in a barber shop in Harlem on a Saturday. You just sit there, and one minute you marvel at the great wit, the great intelligence, and the native genius that are expressed in philosophy, foreign affairs, and politics. And the next minute you are crying because society fails to develop this genius. Let us work at trying to recognize the strengths that people have. What they are bringing to society is a compassion, a humaneness, a style, a grace, that God knows this society needs. They may not be bringing technological know-how and scientific know-how and large numbers of degrees, but this society needs "soul," and that is what the people I am talking about can bring to it.

Let us quit being naïve about what brings about change in society. The action is called politics. That is the action. Social work is a profession with a potential base that is fantastic if we count all our clients plus all of the social workers. People who are paid to do social work, plus our board members, could turn this country around politically.

Advise your clients about politics and their rights. Instead of telling them, "Too bad about the garbage," say, "Are you a registered voter? Go down and see the sanitation man. Organize in your neighborhoods."

Help them organize. Help them to become political sophisticates. That is what the medical profession does. Why do you think we were delayed so long in securing Medicare? It was because doctors were almost threatening people, not waiting on them in their offices until they first explained the great dangers

inherent in socialized medicine. They use their clientele. For far too long we have used the excuse of tax-exempt status, the excuse of being a part of the community chest, or covered by the Hatch Act. You can be a lot more sophisticated than that. You can get involved. And you are going to have to get involved in political action. You, as a citizen, are going to have to get involved at the level of picking the delegates who are going to choose the candidates. The average social work group is sitting around waiting to see who is going to be elected or nominated at the Democratic or the Republican Convention.

Start thinking about being one of the delegates so that we can have a role in it. We have to insist that we get involved as agencies because our clients will not believe that we are sincere unless they see us standing up for rent supplements, unless they see us standing up for model cities, and for new housing. That is the kind of legislation that makes them say, "My social worker and that agency care about me." If the only time they see you is when you are telling them not to have any more babies, then you are merely interfering with their sex life.

If they never see you when they are trying to get better schools and better housing and more money (when they can take care of their own sex life), then they begin to question you seriously.

We must insist that we get in Washington what I call the "social accounting" system, which would be comparable to the Office of Economic Advisors—the President's Council of Economic Advisors—that registers any change in the economic system quickly and adjusts immediately.

We had the sad spectacle last year in Washington of having to go down and tell the top officials in Washington that people were starving to death in Mississippi. The head of OEO did not know it; the head of HEW was not fully aware of it; the head of the Office of Agriculture was shocked. There is no reason why we should have this type of arrangement, and the office of social accounting would correct it. But we have to demand it.

Let me close with a reading. You probably saw the Martin Luther King March in Memphis the week before his tragic assassination. If you recall watching that march on television you

noticed that all the men in that particular march were wearing a sign saying, "I am a Man." I was curious about where this originated and what its full meaning might be. It comes from a song that Brooke Benton, a popular singer, produced for the Martin Luther King salute some years ago. I think it expresses more than anything else just whom you are dealing with today: the disinherited, the disadvantaged, their allies, and the quality of their determination. When I say, "their allies," I mean people like me and, I hope, people like you.

I'm a Man and I just want to live like one.

Why must I fight for what I want?

I'm so weary and it is more than I can stand.

I'm a Man and I want to hold my head up high.

I'm flesh and blood and I've got pride.

Can't they see it? Won't they ever understand?

I'm a Man.

How do I hide the tears in my eyes

When I go to tell my son?

The things he's heard—they're no more than lies.

He's as good as anyone.

I'm a Man.

And soon the day is goin' to come,

When I'll be free to live like one.

Then I'll stand tall and be seen for what I am.

I'm a Man . . . I'm a Man . . . I'm a Man.

The San Francisco Story

by WAYNE VASEY

THE STORY OF THE 95TH ANNUAL FORUM is told only in part by the published papers. This Forum was unlike any held in recent times. I want to share with the readers of this volume my impressions of that week of May 26-31, 1968, in San Francisco.

"An Action Platform for Human Welfare" was the theme, and action there was. Demonstrations, walkouts, challenging of speakers, and picketing were the outward signs of a surge of excitement and unrest that carried through the eventful week. Speakers at many of the scheduled meetings maintained the action theme as they expressed the sense of the urgent need for change in social welfare, and as they stated repeatedly their conviction that social welfare was not moving far enough and fast enough to meet the demands of today's crucial times. "Crisis" and "irrelevancy" were words heard many times from the platform as speakers addressed themselves to the current scene.

It was the largest Forum in history, in attendance, with almost 8,200 registered, and certainly the most tumultuous in recent years.

In a sense, the Annual Forum mirrored the turbulent times in which we are living. Undoubtedly, most of us felt the influence of the Poor People's March which was taking place that week in Washington. Welfare rights organizations had been formed throughout the country and had sent representatives to the Annual Forum. The black social workers were organizing throughout the nation and found in the Annual Forum an opportunity to convene a national representation. In California the fruit workers were on strike and faced a crucial period in the grape-growing area of Delano, as the grapes were about ready for pick-

ing. And many of us were acutely aware of the recent student uprisings at Columbia University, San Francisco State College, and on many other campuses.

The swelling chorus of discontent with current welfare programs had been increasing in the months preceding the meeting. The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders had released its report in March, 1968, and had included social welfare among the institutions singled out for mention as inadequate in response to the problems of the times. Leaders in both public and voluntary social welfare, academicians, liberal politicians, leaders of industry, labor officials, religious leaders, and many others had been voicing severe criticisms of social welfare and had been advocating drastic change in the public programs. Social welfare was very much before the public through coverage in radio, television, newspapers and magazines.

On the other hand, only the year before, Congress in approving the Social Security Amendments of 1967 had enacted some of the most restrictive public assistance sections in the thirty-two-year history of these programs under the Social Security Act. President Johnson was at that very time under pressure to sign a bill passed by Congress which included an expenditure cut of \$6 billion. It was anticipated that much of this reduction would come out of the funds earmarked for the various social programs. Thus many forces and counterforces were at work nationwide when the Annual Forum was held.

"Activists Take Over Parley of 95 Year Old Body," said the *New York Times* on June 1; "Social Workers Demonstrating for Change at the Parley," said the morning news of Wilmington, Delaware; "Welfare's New Thrust" was the headline for a story that appeared in the *Monitor*, a Catholic newspaper in San Francisco, on June 6, 1968. These and other news stories were indicative of the spirit of the Forum.

The first episode in which I was involved as President came in the form of a telephone call to my home in Ann Arbor, Michigan, the week before the Annual Forum. The call was from a member of the Sacramento chapter of NASW, who was speaking for a group of social workers concerned over the threat to the strike

which had been called by the fruit workers in California. This person wanted me to know that a demonstration and picket line were planned for the General Session which featured U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark as the speaker. The problem related to the importation of temporary workers from Mexico who with their "green cards" were alleged to be working in the grape-growing areas and to be presenting a threat to a strike which had lasted for several years and which my respondent felt had a good chance for success. The Department of Justice, it was stated, was being asked to enforce regulations against the importation of such workers as strikebreakers.

On the opening day of the Conference, Sunday, May 26, I was visited by two men (one of whom had been in my seminar at Michigan during the preceding term) who spoke for the National Welfare Rights Organization in Washington. They asked that a report be given at the opening session to inform the membership of the progress of the Poor People's March in Washington. I told him of the Conference's ban on such unscheduled reports, however meritorious the cause. It was agreed that an announcement would be made of a meeting to be held immediately after the General Session for the purposes presented.

The meeting was held, and four separate groups were formed under the general designation "Coalition for Action Now." One of the four groups had as its function the mobilizing of support for the Poor People's March; another, for the National Welfare Rights Organization; a third was established to back the fruit workers; and the fourth, to study the structure of the Conference with the purpose of converting it into an action body.

The next day the Executive Director, Joe Hoffer, and I began receiving a number of requests for changes and shifts in the program. Many of them could not be met within the structure and function of the Conference, but it was quite evident that the pressures throughout the week would be intense and that the traditional pattern of the Annual Forum faced severe challenges.

On Monday night, following the scheduled General Session, the National Board of NCSW was convened in a special meeting in the President's suite to examine some of the requests and to

agree upon a course of action. We felt that the situation was critical and demanded constructive response. One of the board members had just come from a meeting of the Coalition for Action Now and reported that the participants were extremely eager to have resolutions presented and acted upon in support of the various causes with which they were concerned. These resolutions were intended to place the Conference on record on some of the major issues.

This proposed action was in direct conflict with the Preamble to the Constitution of the National Conference as revised in 1961. In stating the nature of the organization the Preamble stipulates that the Conference "does not take an official position on controversial issues and adopts no resolutions except occasional resolutions of courtesy." This was expressive of the historic purpose of the organization as an educational body designed to offer opportunity for presentation of a wide range of opinion of issues, problems, and methods in social welfare.

It was agreed by the board that a scheduled meeting of representatives of national agencies would be converted into a "town meeting" for the presentation of resolutions. All action taken at this meeting would represent only the decision of those in attendance and would not be binding on the Conference. This information was conveyed to the representatives of Coalition for Action Now and was announced at subsequent general sessions.

Meanwhile, the black social workers were holding a separate caucus. The Conference was asked to provide an opportunity at the general meetings for presentation of a statement. It was agreed that this would be done.

Another event taking place concurrently was a meeting of Conference attenders who had organized to support the fruit workers. They requested an opportunity to meet with Attorney General Clark prior to his speech and to have a question period following his speech. I telephoned the Attorney General's office to present this request but found that his schedule was so tight that it would not be possible for him to meet all the demands.

The Executive Director and staff of the Conference had in the meantime made arrangements for free admission of the fruit

workers and of welfare recipients to the various parts of the program.

Space does not permit the detailing of many of the events that took place during the week. There were silent vigils in support of the peace movement; peaceful demonstrations took place in the lobby of the Convention Hall; various collection points were set up to secure money in support of the Poor People's March. These and other activities were part of the scene of action and excitement.

It seems to me that Wednesday, May 29, was the high point for action. It began that morning when representatives of the black social workers presented their statement at the morning's General Session. Four of their leaders stood on the platform while the crowd filed in. A center section had been cordoned off for the black social workers. After an interval of waiting for the crowd to gather, the statement was read from the platform and the men on the platform left. As they walked down the aisle they were followed by the contingent in the center section.

In the position statement, the National Association of Black Social Workers (NABSW) stated that the preamble of the Constitution of NCSW does not reflect the action theme of the Forum, and recommended that it be changed accordingly. The Association further stated that the NCSW is an "American white institution in so far as the members of its Board and planning committee do not reflect an ethnic composition commensurate with its expressed concern." The statement called on the NCSW to accept NABSW selected members on the Executive Committee and all planning committees of NCSW, demanded that people "who speak, write, research and evaluate the black community be black people," and directed white social workers "to involve themselves with solving the problem of white racism—America's number one mental health problem." They called on the NCSW to repudiate the present welfare system publicly, to support efforts to repeal Public Law 90248, on welfare amendments of 1967, and to invite the National Welfare Rights Organization into full membership in the Conference. In these and other parts of their statement, the NABSW expressed its concern with the present welfare structure

and programs, and concluded with the sentence, "We are committed to the reconstruction of systems to make them relevant to the needs of the black community, and are pledged to do all that we can to bring these about by any means necessary."

At the board meeting the preceding Monday evening I had appointed three members to work with persons preparing the resolutions for the "town meeting." The resolutions were in hand by noon of Wednesday.

There were about 1,600 persons present at the special meeting. I had consented to chair this meeting even though it was not an official session of the Conference. It was the feeling of the officers and the board that this kind of interchange between the Conference leadership and its membership was vitally important.

Microphones had been placed throughout the auditorium. Discussion was brief, since the time was short. Many did not vote. Some expressed later the feeling that as organization representatives they did not feel justified in committing their respective sponsors. Of the resolutions acted upon, twelve might be said to pertain to the "issues of the day," including the Poor People's March, the effort of the United Farm Workers' organizing committee to insure the protection of their rights, the repeal of the restrictive provisions in the 1967 amendments to the Social Security Act, the concept of a national system of income maintenance, and others, including the importance of student self-determination, the right to dissent, the right of social workers to engage in collective bargaining, and a declaration of conscience in reference to the war in Vietnam. All of these were passed. Eleven resolutions presented at the meeting pertained to the organization of the National Conference on Social Welfare. Of these, ten were approved. The one rejected would have made action at the meeting binding on NCSW. Four of the resolutions pertained to the Constitution of NCSW; four, to the organization of the Annual Forum; two were action on resolutions and two on other general subjects, including support of the black caucus position statement. One resolution called for a democratic selection of officers with a double slate for all positions, and asked for the resignation of the President-elect to permit early implementation.

The next event took place that same evening. Attorney General Clark consented to meet with representatives of the friends of the fruit workers and with representatives of the NCSW. We convened in his suite prior to the meeting, and he discussed the position of the Department of Justice with regard to enforcement of the prohibition on the importation of Mexican labor to the fruit-growing areas.

When we arrived at the General Session, we found the room ringed by demonstrators waving banners. Others were in the lobby outside the hotel ballroom in which the meeting was being held. Still others were seated in a cordoned-off section in the center of the hall. As we marched onto the platform there were shouts from the demonstrators. Many of the demonstrators were fruit workers who had been bussed in by the social workers who were sponsoring their cause at the Annual Forum. The demonstration was lively but orderly.

The Attorney General began his speech but midway was interrupted by two friends of the fruit workers who used bull horns to convey their questions. This continued for about five minutes, accompanied by shouts from various points of the room from members of the audience who disapproved of the interruption. The Attorney General then finished his speech without further incident.

In the regular meeting of the National Board on the final day of the Conference it was agreed that a social action committee would be established to review the various resolutions and to make recommendations to the board.

The foregoing is at best only a sketchy account of the events of the week. Other instances could also be noted. For the first time, so far as I know, in the history of the Conference one of its exhibits was picketed by a union. Political candidates requested permission to speak or to send representatives.

The speeches at many sessions, and certainly at the general meetings, had a rhetoric of action and change. The audiences were very responsive. It was evident that there was a general sense of deep concern, and an air of crisis.

The events of the week must have been baffling to the seasoned

Forum attender, as well as to the Conference member who received his accounts of the week through the daily papers. It is possible, however, to infer erroneously from the coverage of the more dramatic events that the week had a carnival atmosphere. It should be noted that in the midst of all the excitement the meetings went on generally as planned, with no more than the usual cancellations due to failure of a speaker to appear or to other changes in the program. Attendance at the various sessions was high in spite of the attractions of a glamorous city at its best in a week of beautiful weather.

What does this portend for the future of the Conference? It is too early to assess fully the impact of this year's meeting. The voices of the young and of the minorities were heard, but so were those of many of the older members who share the sense of need for action in these times.

It is my opinion that the protest was directed at the social welfare system, not just at NCSW. The Annual Forum provided an opportunity for expression of a need for massive action by the social work profession and by the social welfare institutional network to find more effective and dynamic ways to contribute to the shaping of social policy.

It would be a serious mistake, I believe, to treat this year's Annual Forum as simply a lively episode in the life of the NCSW. The militancy which surfaced at the meetings and in the halls was rooted in a deep sense of conviction regarding the need for a vast change in the way our society faces its problems.

Protest can be abrasive and disquieting. I shall not pretend that the staff, the officers, and the board had anything but an extremely trying week. But I believe that all of us felt that we were participants in a significant event in the history of the National Conference.

One newspaper account sums it up in these words: "From here on, the NCSW people will never be the same. They will be better."

Message from the President-elect

by *ARTHUR S. FLEMMING*

I HAVE NOTED with a great deal of interest the emphasis that has been placed at this Forum on the development of an action platform for human welfare. I have long felt that those who are engaged in the social work profession have not done as effective a job as should be done to bring about political action in order to achieve the objectives in which they believe. I consider it an honor and a privilege to work with you in marshaling the resources that are available to social workers in order to obtain action in the political realm.

I am in complete agreement with Whitney Young when he says that this is the way in which we can achieve our objectives. He has referred to the National Advisory Commission Report on Civil Disorders. This is the most significant public document of my lifetime, a report entitled to our unqualified support. There is no doubt in my mind but that it can and should constitute an action platform for human welfare.

I have been disappointed in the way in which this report has been received by some who occupy high positions in government and by others who aspire to high positions in government. I agree completely with Whitney Young's comment on the indictment against our white society that is returned in this report. There is no concern in my mind about what some people consider its undue emphasis on collective guilt. The concept of collective guilt is well established and well understood, it seems to me, as the result of our Judeo-Christian tradition. The Old Testament prophets did not hesitate to condemn a nation when they felt that that nation should be condemned.

Mr. Young has analyzed effectively and accurately the nature

of this indictment against our white society. I believe that we should accept it, plead guilty, and go to work to do the things that can be done to rectify the evils that have come from white racism in this country.

I have been especially interested in the recommendations of the National Advisory Commission in regard to welfare. I was particularly interested in the reference to the so-called "man in the house" rule as well as to the restriction on new residents of a state. The Commission recommended forthrightly that these provisions be eliminated and then said that "these restrictions are currently being challenged in the courts. We believe that legislative and administrative action should be taken to eliminate them now." It is a sad commentary on our lack of political action in this area that we have to rely on the courts to rectify an obvious injustice. I hope that as a part of our political action program we will try to rally support for getting rid of these particular provisions.

Then, of course, there is the National Advisory Commission's reference to the 1967 welfare amendments. They say that "these amendments freeze for each state the percentage of children who can be covered by federal AFDC grants to the percentage of coverage in that state in January, 1968." Then the Commission points out that "the anticipated effect of this new restriction will be to prevent federal assistance during 1968 to 470 thousand new applicants otherwise eligible under present standards."

We condemn the Congress, and properly so, for the passage of these amendments. But what did we do to develop support for opposition to these amendments when they were being considered by the House of Representatives and the Senate? Yes, responsibility does rest with the Congress, but some responsibility rests on our shoulders for our failure, our unwillingness to travel the second mile in order to make it clear to the Congress that if they passed amendments of this kind, they would be dealing with a political buzz saw. We did not do it! What did we do to organize public opinion in such a way that the President of the United States would feel that it was imperative for him to veto those amendments rather than sign the bill?

Of course, I have been particularly interested in the fact that in the opening paragraphs of this particular part of the report, the members of this Commission say that "the system is deficient in two ways. First, it excludes large numbers of persons who are in great need and who, if provided adequate level of support, might be able to become more productive and self-sufficient." Then it says, "Second, for those who are included it prescribes assistance well below the minimum for a decent level of existence and imposes restrictions that encourage continued dependency on welfare and undermine self-respect."

We agree with this indictment, but what are we going to do about it? We cannot correct the conditions that are so accurately set forth in this indictment unless we convince the American people that they, in turn, must say to the Congress of the United States: We have reached the point where we are willing to pay additional taxes in order to correct this situation.

It is my privilege to serve with Whitney Young, as a member of the Executive Committee of the National Urban Coalition, which is now headed by Dr. John Gardner, the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. On the Monday afternoon prior to the funeral service for Dr. King in Atlanta, we met as an Executive Committee and passed a series of resolutions. One of these resolutions reads as follows:

The Urban Coalition urges more realistic attention to the fiscal and monetary circumstances in which the Nation must seek to solve its problems. Above all else these circumstances call for a specific reordering of national priorities rather than an across-the-board cut of federal expenditures without regard to need or merit. Such cuts, irrational by definition, could produce tragic results and we oppose them.

If the Congress rises to its responsibility it will increase—not cut—expenditures for essential programs such as jobs, housing, education, and community services.

Pending the accomplishment of the reordering of priorities and the reorientation of our resources in light of urban needs, the Urban Coalition urges adoption of a tax increase.

But what is happening? The House of Representatives has before it a conference report which provides for a \$6 billion

across-the-board cut. The President of the United States at a press conference indicated that if that bill comes to him he is going to sign it. What is wrong? How did we let the members of Congress get in such a frame of mind that they consider it politically safe to accept a \$6 billion across-the-board cut? It is indefensible. You know, and I know, that it is the service areas of the federal government that will be seriously impaired by such a cut.

You know and I know that one program after another in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will be put through the wringer as the result of such action. Why is it that we cannot persuade the Congress of the United States that our people will not stand for indefensible action of this kind? Why is it that we cannot persuade the President of the United States that instead of signing he should veto such a bill?

The NCSW represents tremendous resources. But how are we going to rally public opinion? There is not a chance in the world of implementing the recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders without providing the federal government with additional revenues, without the federal government making additional appropriations. Yet, in spite of last summer's riots in the cities, in spite of the recommendations of this Commission, instead of moving toward making a larger and more significant investment in our welfare programs we are moving in exactly the opposite direction. There is something wrong.

Each one of us must ask the question: Have I done everything that I can and should do to make my congressman, my senators, the President of the United States, aware of my views? Have I done everything that I can do to make my clients and other citizens of my community aware of the significance of these issues? Have I done everything that I can do to persuade them to write to members of Congress, to write to the President, and indicate that they will not stand for dealing with human beings in the way in which they are being dealt with?

I submit to you that as individuals, as members of organizations, as leaders within our communities, we have not done all that we can do. I believe that it is possible to convince a significant

number of our citizens that the time for talk is over and the time for action has arrived. I believe that it is possible to convince them that the National Advisory Commission Report is a solemn warning of a domestic "Pearl Harbor," that time has run out, and that we had better do something about it. And if it is this kind of an action program that you are interested in—that the organizations of which you are a part are interested in—I look forward with great enthusiasm to working with you in the months that lie just ahead. I believe that this is the kind of action program that is imperative for America if we are to avoid catastrophe. It is imperative for America if we are to make clear that we do believe in, and are committed to, the concept of the dignity and worth of each human being.

Congratulations on the kind of Conference, the kind of Forum, you have had, on your willingness to come to grips with these basic issues. Let us move forward from this point, keeping in mind that this is an election year. This does offer a tremendous opportunity to persuade America to move in the right direction so far as these issues are concerned. Let us give our unqualified support to the recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.

I look forward to the year that lies ahead.

Appendix A: Program

THE MAJOR FUNCTION of the National Conference on Social Welfare (NCSW) is to provide a dynamic educational forum for the critical examination of basic welfare problems and issues.

Programs of the Annual Forums are divided into two parts: (1) the General Sessions and the meetings of the section and division committees, all of which are arranged by the NCSW Program Committee and the National Board; and (2) meetings which are arranged by the associate and special groups affiliated with the NCSW.

In addition to arranging these meetings, associate and special groups participate in the over-all planning of the Annual Forum programs.

In order that the NCSW may continue to provide a democratic forum in which all points of view are represented, it is prohibited by its Constitution from taking positions on social issues. Individuals who appear on Annual Forum programs speak for themselves and have no authority to use the name of the NCSW in any way which would imply that the organization has participated in or endorsed their statements or positions.

Theme: An Action Platform for Human Welfare

SUNDAY, MAY 26

2:00 P.M.—3:30 P.M.

ORIENTATION MEETING

Presiding and speaker: Milton Chernin, Dean, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley

Speaker: Sara Lee Berkman, Assistant Executive Secretary, NCSW, New York

3:45 P.M.—5:00 P.M.

PROSPECTS FOR HELSINKI

Presiding: Kenneth W. Kindelsperger, Dean, Raymond A. Kent School of Social Work, University of Louisville, Louisville, Ky.; Chairman, U.S. Committee of the International Council on Social Welfare

Speaker: Reuben C. Baetz, Executive Director, Canadian Welfare Council, Ottawa

Sponsor: U.S. Committee of ICSW

8:00 P.M.

OPENING GENERAL SESSION

Presiding: Nathan E. Cohen, Professor of Social Welfare and Dean-elect, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Los Angeles; Past President, NCSW

The Welfare Crisis

Speaker: Wayne Vasey, Professor, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; former Dean, George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis; President, NCSW

Greetings from the Hon. Ronald Reagan, Governor of California

Spencer Williams, Administrator, California Health and Welfare Agency, Sacramento

CONFERENCE RECEPTION

MONDAY, MAY 27

9:00 A.M.—10:45 A.M.

GENERAL SESSION

A Creative Approach to Manpower in Social Welfare

Presiding: Joseph H. Reid, Executive Director, Child Welfare League of America, New York; First Vice President, NCSW

Greetings from City of San Francisco

Jack Morrison, Chairman, Board of Supervisors, Social Service Committee, City and County of San Francisco

Speaker: Frank Riessman, Professor of Educational Sociology and Director, New Careers Training Laboratory, New York University, New York

New Careers in Social Work: New Manpower, New Services

Speaker: Arthur Pearl, Professor of Education, Division of Sociological Service, School of Education, University of Oregon, Eugene

11:15 A.M.—12:45 P.M.

POLITICS AND GHETTO PERPETUATION

Presiding: David Hunter, Executive Director, Stern Family Fund, New York

Speaker: Norton E. Long, Chairman, Department of Politics, Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.

Discussants: Melvin B. Mogulof, Director, Model Cities Program, Department of Housing and Urban Development, San Francisco

Martin Rein, Graduate Department of Social Work, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

Sponsor: Division (cosponsored by National Assembly and NCSW)

**CONSULTATION: THE AUTHORITY, SKILLS,
AND TECHNIQUES OF THE CONSULTANT**

Presiding: Mrs. Burney K. Olson, Director, Child Care Services, Hope Cottage, Children's Bureau, Dallas

Speaker: Edith Schulhofer, Professor, School of Social Work, Tulane University, New Orleans

The Social Caseworker as a Consultant

Speaker: Eugene Ratajczak, Professor and Associate Director, School of Social Work, University of Texas, Arlington

Sponsor: Section I (Casework), Group Meeting 1

NEW MODALITIES IN CASEWORK

Presiding: Elizabeth J. Coyle, Program Deputy, Marin County Department of Public Social Services, San Rafael, Calif.

Speaker: Werner A. Lutz, Professor, School of Social Work, University of Connecticut, West Hartford

Sponsor: Section I (Casework), Group Meeting 2

**ROLE THEORY—APPLICATIONS TO PRACTICE:
CASEWORK AND GROUP WORK**

Presiding: Jeannette Harris, Associate Regional Commissioner for Children's Bureau, Region IX, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, San Francisco

Speaker: Raymond Fisher, Professor, School of Graduate Work, University of Hawaii, Honolulu

Discussant: Virginia L. Tannar, Staff Development Specialist, Children's Bureau, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Sponsor: Section I (Casework), Group Meeting 3

**THE PUBLIC SCHOOL AS A NATURAL
MENTAL HEALTH CENTER**

Presiding: Dorothy C. Wilson, Supervisor of Social Service, Julia Dyckman Andrus Memorial Children's Home, Yonkers, N.Y.

The Role of the Director

Speaker: Stonewall B. Stickney, M.D., Director, Division of Mental Health Services, Pittsburgh Public Schools

The Role of the Social Worker

Speaker: (Miss) Billie Reed, social worker, Division of Mental Health Services, Pittsburgh Public Schools

The Role of the Coordinator in the Mental Health Services

Speaker: George J. Wilson, social worker, Division of Mental Health Services, Pittsburgh Public Schools

Sponsor: Section I (Casework), Group Meeting 4

**FAMILY GROUP TREATMENT AND THE
SOCIAL GROUP WORKER**

Presiding: Gertrude Wilson, Professor Emeritus and Consultant, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley

Speaker: Carole S. Noreen, Social Work Supervisor, Charles F. Read Zone Center, State of Illinois Department of Mental Health, Chicago
Sponsor: Section II (Group Work), Group Meeting 1

HOW SOCIAL GROUP WORK METHODOLOGY CAN CONTRIBUTE TO THE GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF LARGE NATIONAL PROGRAMS

Presiding: Ira L. Gibbons, Director, Social Services, Head Start, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.
Speaker: Harry Specht, Lecturer, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley
Sponsor: Section II (Group Work), Group Meeting 2

THE FOSTER GRANDPARENT PROGRAM—IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIAL GROUP WORKERS

Presiding: Mrs. Margaret Horton, foster grandparent, Family Service Agency, San Francisco
Speaker: Bernard E. Nash, Deputy Commissioner, Administration on Aging, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.
Discussants: Mrs. Inez Pennell, Mrs. Mary Idlet, Mrs. Mary Helen Nolan, Mrs. Alice Woods, Stanley Hirst, Harry Rosenblatt
Sponsor: Section II (Group Work), Group Meeting 3

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION FOR WHAT: POLITICAL POWER OR SERVICE DELIVERY?

Presiding: Robert F. Fenley, Director, Operation LEAP Administration, Phoenix, Ariz.
Coauthors and speakers: Arnold Gurin, Professor, Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.
 Joan Ecklein, Assistant Professor, Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.
 A Federal Program for Neighborhood Services
Coauthors and speakers: Hobart Burch, Deputy Director, Interagency Relations, National Institute of Mental Health, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bethesda, Md.
 Edward Newman, Executive Director, Massachusetts Rehabilitation Planning Commission, Boston

Cosponsors:

Section III (Community Organization and Social Action), Group Meeting 1
 Council on Social Work Education

THE PUBLIC WELFARE POWER STRUCTURE: THE POLITICS OF CHANGE

Presiding: Paul Le Vecque, Field Supervisor, Division of Family Services, Department of Health and Welfare, State of Maine, Augusta
 Public Assistance Power Structure

Speakers: Sydney E. Bernard, Associate Professor, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Philip Booth, Lecturer, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

From the Outside: Breaking the Dole Barrier

Speaker: John Erlich, Assistant Professor, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Discussant: Mrs. Geraldine Aronin, Chief of Community Relations, Department of Public Welfare, Baltimore

Sponsor: Section III (Community Organization and Social Action), Group Meeting 2

WORK WITH YOUTH GANGS: TAKING STOCK OF OUR SUCCESSES AND FAILURES

Presiding: George M. Nishinaka, Executive Director, Special Services for Groups, Los Angeles

Speaker: Catherine V. Richards, Special Consultant to the Chief on Youth Services, Children's Bureau, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Discussant: Malcolm W. Klein, Project Director, Youth Studies Center, University of Southern California, Los Angeles

Cosponsors:

Section II (Group Work), Group Meeting 4

Section IV (Social Research), Group Meeting 1

URBAN VIOLENCE: IMPLICATIONS OF THE WATTS RIOT FOR SOCIAL WORK

Presiding: Maurice B. Hamovitch, Professor, School of Social Work, University of Southern California, Los Angeles

Speaker: Nathan E. Cohen, Professor of Social Welfare and Dean-elect, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Los Angeles; Past President, NCSW

The Sons of Watts: Riot Aftermath

Speaker: Douglas Glasgow, Special Research Fellow, School of Social Work, University of Southern California, Los Angeles

Cosponsors:

Section III (Community Organization and Social Action), Group Meeting 3

Section IV (Social Research), Group Meeting 2

THE ADMINISTRATOR AND PRESSURES FOR NEW REPRESENTATION

Presiding: Alexander J. Allen, Director, Eastern Region, National Urban League, New York

Speakers: Hubert Locke, Director of Religious Affairs, Wayne State University, Detroit

Franklin Zweig, Associate Professor, School of Social Work, Wayne State University, Detroit

George A. Wiley, Executive Director, National Welfare Rights Organization, Washington, D.C.

Sponsor: Section V (Administration), Group Meeting 1

FILM THEATER

Film: Victims

Sponsor: NCSW Audio-Visual Committee

EARNING AND SUSTAINING CITIZEN SUPPORT:
A CASE HISTORY*Presiding:* John H. McMahon, Director of Public Relations, State Communities Aid Association, New York*Speaker:* Leopold Lippman, Coordinator, Mental Retardation Programs, California Health and Welfare Agency, Sacramento*Reactors:* Alfred V. Taylor, Director, Public Relations Services, Family Service Association, New York

Myra Koplin, Director, Mental Retardation Project, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Los Angeles

Sponsor: NCSW Public Relations Committee

1:00 P.M.—1:45 P.M.

FILM THEATER

Film: Jerry

Sponsor: NCSW Audio-Visual Committee

2:00 P.M.—3:30 P.M.

THE OUTLOOK FOR CREATIVE FEDERALISM

Presiding: C. F. McNeil, Executive Director, National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, New York; Chairman, NCSW Public Relations and Development Committee*Speaker:* Daniel J. Elazar, Professor, Department of Political Science, and Director, Center for the Study of Federalism, Temple University, Philadelphia*Discussant:* Melvin B. Mogulof, Director, Model Cities Program, Department of Housing and Urban Development, San Francisco

Sponsor: Division (cosponsored by National Assembly and NCSW)

CASEWORK INTERVENTION IN THE SERVICE
OF LOWER-CLASS NEGRO FAMILIES

The Absent Father in Negro Families: Cause or Symptom?

Speaker: Herbert L. Wasserman, Chief Social Worker, Mental Health Unit, Tufts-New England Medical Center, Boston

Difficulty of Family Functioning in a Hostile Environment

Speaker: William H. Grier, M.D., psychiatrist, Pacific Psychotherapy Associates, San Francisco

Sponsor: Section I (Casework), Group Meeting 1

LAW, PSYCHIATRY, SOCIAL WORK, AND
HUMAN RIGHTS*Presiding:* Scott Briar, Associate Professor, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley

Speaker: Bernard L. Diamond, M.D., psychiatrist and psychoanalyst; Professor, Boalt School of Law and School of Criminology, University of California, Berkeley

Speaker: The Hon. Nicholas Petris, state senator; coauthor of Lauterman-Petris-Short Act; Chairman, Senate Labor Committee, 11th Senatorial District, Alameda Co., Calif.

Speaker: Francis P. Purcell, Director, Department of Social Work Education, San Francisco State College

Cosponsors:

Section I (Casework), Group Meeting 2

National Conference of Lawyers and Social Workers

INTEGRATION OF SOCIAL WORK METHODS IN GIVING SERVICE IN PUBLIC WELFARE

Presiding: Alfred F. Angster, Executive Director, Lutheran Welfare Services of Illinois, Chicago

Speaker: Mrs. Louise Shoemaker, Assistant Professor, School of Social Work, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia

Discussant: Nancy A. Humphreys, Head Training Supervisor, County of Los Angeles Department of Social Services, Los Angeles

Sponsor: Section II (Group Work), Group Meeting 1

PANEL PRESENTATION ON SOCIAL GROUP WORK PRACTICE IN PSYCHIATRIC SETTINGS

Presiding: Daniel Thursz, School of Social Work, University of Maryland, Baltimore

Panelists: Marion B. Sloan, Lecturer and Coordinator of Group Work Field Work, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley
Marion Woodward, social group worker, San Francisco Day Treatment Center, California Department of Mental Hygiene

Donald Feiner, Supervising Psychiatric Social Worker, Children's Center, Napa State Hospital, Napa, Calif.

Andrew H. Curry, Adult In-Patient Service, Langley-Porter Neuro-Psychiatric Institute, San Francisco

Sponsor: Section II (Group Work), Group Meeting 2

PROGRAM: A TOOL OF THE WORKER OR OF THE GROUP?

Presiding: Mrs. Sarah Short Austin, Washington, D.C.

Speaker: Lawrence Shulman, Lecturer on Social Group Work, School of Social Work, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia

Sponsor: Section II (Group Work), Group Meeting 3

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING FOR SPECIAL PROBLEM AREAS

Presiding: Robert Morris, Professor of Social Planning, Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.

Coauthors and speakers: Harold Demone, Executive Director, United Community Services, Boston
Edward Newman, Executive Director, Massachusetts Rehabilitation Planning Commission, Boston

Cosponsors:

Section I (Casework), Group Meeting 3

Section III (Community Organization and Social Action), Group Meeting 1

SOCIOECONOMIC POLICIES FOR SLUMS

Presiding: Seymour L. Wolfbein, Dean, School of Business Administration, Temple University, Philadelphia

Economic Policy for the American Slum

Speaker: Robert J. Lampman, Professor, Department of Economics, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Manpower Policy

Speaker: Curtis Aller, Director, Office of Manpower Policy Evaluation and Research, Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

Incomes and Income-Maintenance Policies

Speaker: George F. Rohrlich, Professor of Political Economy and Social Insurance, Temple University, Philadelphia

Sponsor: Section III (Community Organization and Social Action), Group Meeting 2

MODES OF TREATMENT FOR FAMILY PROBLEMS

Presiding: Jerome Cohen, Associate Professor, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Los Angeles

Speakers: Ann W. Shyne, Director, Institute of Welfare Research, Community Service Society of New York, New York

William J. Reid, Assistant Director, Institute of Welfare Research; Director, Center for Social Casework Research, Community Service Society of New York, New York

Cosponsors:

Section I (Casework), Group Meeting 4

Section IV (Social Research), Group Meeting 1

RESEARCH AS A BASE FOR PROGRAM PLANNING:

EXAMPLES FROM MENTAL HEALTH AND

ALCOHOLIC TREATMENT SERVICES

Presiding: Mrs. Muriel W. Pumphrey, Coordinator of Research Development, Social Science Institute, Washington University, St. Louis

Speakers: Helen B. Klein, Assistant Professor of Psychiatry in Social Work, Missouri Institute of Psychiatry, St. Louis

Laura Root, Director, Alcoholism Education Program, Social Science Institute, Washington University, St. Louis

Cosponsors:

Section IV (Social Research), Group Meeting 2

Section V (Administration), Group Meeting 1

**MEDICAL CARE IN URBAN AREAS: THE
NEIGHBORHOOD HEALTH CENTER AS A NEW MODEL
FOR SERVICE DELIVERY**

Presiding: Wilbur Parker, Director of Research, California Department
of Social Welfare, Sacramento

Overview

Speaker: Joseph T. English, M.D., Assistant Director, Office of Economic
Opportunity for Health Affairs, Washington, D.C.

Case Example: Chicago

Speaker: Joyce C. Lashof, M.D., Director, Section of Community Medi-
cine, Presbyterian-St. Luke's Hospital, Chicago

Issues and Problems

Speaker: Darwin Palmiere, Associate Professor of Medical Care Organi-
zation, School of Public Health, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Sponsor: Section V (Administration), Group Meeting 2

4:00 P.M.—5:30 P.M.

THE STATES AND THE GHETTOS

Presiding: Ernest F. Witte, Dean, School of Social Work, San Diego
State College, San Diego, Calif.

Speaker: Charles R. Adrian, Chairman, Department of Political Science,
University of California, Riverside

Discussant: George H. Esser, Jr., Executive Director, North Carolina
Fund, Durham, N.C.

Sponsor: Division (cosponsored by National Assembly and NCSW)

MIGRANTS: PROBLEMS, TRENDS, AND SERVICES

Presiding: Edward M. Carpenter, Associate Executive Director of Projects,
Bay Area Social Planning Council, Oakland, Calif.

A Survey of Current Migrant Issues

Speaker: David North, Executive Director, Interagency Committee on
Mexican-American Affairs, Washington, D.C.

Recruitment of Unskilled Laborers from the Migrant Group for Industry

Speaker: Joe Andrasko, Director of Industrial Relations, Vought Aero-
nautics Division, LTV Aerospace Corp., Dallas

The Responsibility of Casework Agencies to the Migrant

Speaker: Martha Scarlett, Executive Director, Travelers Aid Society of
Alameda County, Calif.

Sponsor: Section I (Casework), Group Meeting 1

REDUCING STRESS: CLIENT FAMILIES AND WORKERS

Presiding: Mrs. Verneice D. Thompson, Chief Clinical Social Worker,
Family Guidance Clinic, Children's Hospital Medical Center, Oakland,
Calif.

Speaker: Phyllis A. Rochelle, Associate Professor, Department of Social
Work Education, San Francisco State College

Discussant: Lydia Rapoport, Professor, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley

Sponsor: Section I (Casework), Group Meeting 2

LAW, PSYCHIATRY, SOCIAL WORK, AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Presiding: Harry Specht, Lecturer, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley

Rights of Children

Speaker: Leontine R. Young, Executive Director, Child Service Association, Newark, N.J.

Rights of the Offender, Mental Patient, and Drug Abuser

Speaker: Richard McGee, President, Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency, Sacramento, Calif.

Rights of the Poor

Coauthor and speaker: Jerome E. Carlin, Coordinator, Neighborhood Legal Assistance Foundation, San Francisco

Cosponsors:

Section I (Casework), Group Meeting 3

National Conference of Lawyers and Social Workers

PANEL PRESENTATION ON SOCIAL GROUP WORK PRACTICE IN PSYCHIATRIC SETTINGS

Sponsor: Section II (Group Work), Group Meeting 1

PEACE CORPS AND VISTA VOLUNTEERS COME TO SOCIAL WORK: IMPLICATIONS FOR GROUP WORK

Speaker: Armand A. Lauffer, Research Associate, Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.

Sponsor: Section II (Group Work), Group Meeting 2

INTEGRATING THE RURAL WELFARE DEPARTMENT INTO THE COMMUNITY—A GROUP APPROACH

Speaker: Hans S. Falck, Professor, School of Social Work, University of Maryland, Baltimore

Discussant: Mrs. Peggy Wood, Associate Professor of Social Work, George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis

Cosponsors:

Section II (Group Work), Group Meeting 3

Section V (Administration), Group Meeting 1

ADVERSARY PLANNING IN THE MODEL CITIES PROGRAM

Presiding: Melvin B. Mogulof, Director, Model Cities Program, Department of Housing and Urban Development, San Francisco

Speakers: Marshall Kaplan, planning consultant, San Francisco

Aaron Wildavsky, Chairman, Department of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley

Discussant: Percy Moore, Executive Director, Oakland Economic Development Corporation, Oakland, Calif.

Sponsor: Section III (Community Organization and Social Action), Group Meeting 1

ECONOMIC ACTION IN THE GHETTO

Circle Associates and the Roxbury Ghetto

Speaker: Noel Day, senior member, Organization for Social and Technical Innovation, Cambridge, Mass.

Sponsor: Section III (Community Organization and Social Action), Group Meeting 2

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED IN RESEARCH AND PRACTICE FROM PROJECT *ENABLE*?

Presiding: Mrs. Ellen P. Manser, specialist in Family Development, Family Service Association of America, New York

Which Parent Groups Were Most Successful and Why—a Conceptual Analysis

Speakers: Aaron Rosenblatt, Assistant Dean, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; formerly Research Director, Project *ENABLE*, New York
Lee M. Wiggins, President, Behavior Metrics, New York

Cosponsors:

Section II (Group Work), Group Meeting 4

Section IV (Social Research), Group Meeting 1

ELIGIBILITY FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Presiding: Edward E. Schwartz, Professor, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago

Establishing Client Eligibility by Declaration Procedures

Coauthor and speaker: Leonard S. Kogan, Director, Center for Social Research, City University of New York, New York

Attitudinal and Behavioral Responses of Ineligible AFDC Applicants: a Longitudinal Study

Coauthor and speaker: Perry Levinson, social science analyst, Division of Intramural Research, Office of Research and Demonstrations, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Cosponsors:

Section IV (Social Research), Group Meeting 2

Section V (Administration), Group Meeting 2

YOUTH, THE NEW MAJORITY (Lindeman Memorial Lecture)

Presiding: Seymour Rosenthal, Chief Social Services Adviser, Model Cities Program, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C.

Speaker: Richard T. Frost, Vice President, Reed College, Portland, Oreg.

Discussants: Bertram M. Beck, Executive Director, Mobilization for Youth, New York

Leonard Zion, Associate Dean of Students, Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.

Cosponsors:

Section III (Community Organization and Social Action), Group Meeting 3
 Section V (Administration), Group Meeting 3

"WAR OF THE WORDS"—A PLAY

Chairman: Mrs. Alfred P. Otto, Jr., member, Greater Bay Area Plays for Living Committee; Board member, Family Service Association of America

Discussion leader: Exie E. Welsch, M.D., child psychiatrist, New York; consultant, Plays for Living, Family Service Association of America

Cosponsors:

Family Service Association of America, Plays for Living Division
 NCSW Audio-Visual Committee

8:30 P.M.

GENERAL SESSION

The Ghettos and Metropolitan Politics

Presiding: Milton Chernin, Dean, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley

Speaker: The Hon. Robert C. Wood, Under Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C.

Discussant: James R. Dumpson, Dean, School of Social Service, Fordham University, New York

Presentation of NCSW Distinguished Service Awards and 50-year Plaques

Sponsor: Division (cosponsored by National Assembly and NCSW)

TUESDAY, MAY 28

9:00 A.M.—10:30 A.M.

KEYNOTE SESSION

Social Policy: "We, the People," Must Act

Presiding: Mrs. Naomi T. Gray, Field Director, Planned Parenthood—World Population, New York

Speaker: Hugh R. Jones, Chairman, State Board of Social Welfare, Utica, N.Y.

Sponsor: Combined Associate Groups

11:00 A.M.—12:30 P.M.

**STRATEGY AND STRATEGISTS: NEW MEANS AND
 DIRECTIONS FOR MOBILIZING ACTION ON THE
 NATIONAL LEVEL**

Presiding: Robert F. Shea, Vice President, American National Red Cross, Washington, D.C.

Speaker: Edward O. Moe, Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Utah, Salt Lake City; Executive Director, Division of Urban and Community Development

Discussants: Mrs. Betti S. Whaley, Program Director, National Urban League, New York

David DeMarche, Executive Director, Service Program for Older San Franciscans, San Francisco

Sponsor: Combined Associate Groups, Application Session 1

STRATEGY AND STRATEGISTS: NEW MEANS AND DIRECTIONS FOR MOBILIZING ACTION ON THE REGIONAL LEVEL

Presiding: Alvin H. Pelavin, attorney and Cochairman, California Inter-agency Council on Family Planning; formerly Regional Representative, Planned Parenthood-World Population, San Francisco

Social Security Legislation 1967: How the Administration Mobilizes Support for the Measures It Proposes

Speaker: Mrs. Virginia M. Smyth, Regional Commissioner, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Atlanta, Ga.

Reactors: Paul Anthony, Executive Director, Southern Regional Council, Seven Region Council, Atlanta, Ga.

Mrs. Freda F. Burnside, Field Consultant, Western Region, Family Service Association of America, San Francisco

Sponsor: Combined Associate Groups, Application Session 2

STRATEGY AND STRATEGISTS: NEW MEANS AND DIRECTIONS FOR MOBILIZING ACTION ON THE STATE LEVEL

Presiding: Sam S. Grais, President, Gray's Drug Stores, St. Paul, Minn.

Speaker: Gordon E. Brown, Executive Director, State Communities Aid Association, New York

Sponsor: Combined Associate Groups, Application Session 3

STRATEGY AND STRATEGISTS: NEW MEANS AND DIRECTIONS FOR MOBILIZING ACTION ON THE CITY LEVEL

Presiding: Rev. Carl E. Thomas, Executive Secretary, Board of Social Ministry, Lutheran Church in America, New York

Speaker: Frank P. Zeidler, consultant, Public Administration and Development Office, Alverno College, Milwaukee; member, Board of Social Ministry, Lutheran Church in America

Reactor: Alex Rosen, Dean, Graduate School of Social Work, New York University, New York

Sponsor: Combined Associate Groups, Application Session 4

STRATEGY AND STRATEGISTS: NEW MEANS AND DIRECTIONS FOR MOBILIZING ACTION ON THE NEIGHBORHOOD LEVEL

Presiding: Gertrude Wilson, Professor Emeritus, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley

Discussants: Solomon Kobrin, Senior Research Associate, Youth Studies Center, University of Southern California, Los Angeles
 Arthur Hillman, Executive Director, NFS Training Center, National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, Chicago
 Mrs. Opal Jones, Director, Neighborhood Adult Participation Project, Office of Economic Opportunity, Los Angeles
 Mrs. Inez Audry, Acting Chairman, Hayes Valley School Committee, San Francisco

Sponsor: Combined Associate Groups, Application Session 5

STRATEGY AND STRATEGISTS: NEW MEANS AND DIRECTIONS FOR MOBILIZING ACTION ON THE RURAL LEVEL

Presiding: Truman Solverud, Manager, Eastern Area, American Red Cross, Alexandria, Va.

Speaker: John H. Southern, Director, Executive Development Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

Discussants: Ralph Keen, General Business Manager, Cherokee Tribe of Oklahoma

John Flores, Fresno Community Service Organization, Fresno, Calif.

Sponsor: Combined Associate Groups, Application Session 6

11:15 A.M.—12:45 P.M.

"THE UNDERGROUND BIRD"—A PLAY

Chairman and discussion leader: Dr. Robert Carter, School of Criminology, University of California, Berkeley

Speaker: Joseph D. Lohman, Dean, School of Criminology, University of California, Berkeley; Board member, American Social Health Association; member, American Social Health Association Committee on Drug Dependence and Abuse

Cosponsors:

Family Service Association of America, Plays for Living Division
 NCSW Audio-Visual Committee

12:50 P.M.

LUNCH AND LEARN

Rehabilitation through the Scriptures

Sponsor: American Bible Society

Special Efforts to Serve Boys and Families in Low-Income Disadvantaged Areas

Discussion leader: Ray W. Sweazey, National Director, Urban Relationships Service, Boy Scouts of America, New Brunswick, N.J.

Sponsor: Boy Scouts of America

Relationship between "Organizing the Poor for Self-Help" and the Delivery of Professional Services

Discussion leader: Rev. R. B. Gutmann, Executive Secretary, Community Services Executive Council, Episcopal Church, New York

Sponsor: Executive Council, Episcopal Church

New Concepts for Social Work's Role in Comprehensive Mental Health Programs

Discussion leader: Else Jockel, Chief of Social Work Programs, Maryland Department of Mental Hygiene, Baltimore

Sponsor: Maryland State Department of Mental Hygiene

Orientation Session: 1967 State Conference Speakers Index

Discussion leader: Thane Griffin, Ohio Citizens' Council for Health and Welfare, Columbus, Ohio

Sponsor: National Association for Statewide Health and Welfare

Manpower: a Community Responsibility

Discussion leaders: Leah E. Parker, Field Representative, National Commission for Social Work Careers, New York

Mrs. Carol Selling, Director, Social Work Careers in Oregon

Sponsor: National Commission for Social Work Careers

New Careers Programs

Discussion leader: Arlene Hannah, training specialist, New Careers Development Center, New York

Sponsor: New Careers Development Center, New York University

New York State Social Work Career Ladder

Discussion leader: Donald Hanson, Assistant Director of Personnel, Department of Mental Hygiene, Albany, N.Y.

Sponsor: New York State Department of Mental Hygiene

Church-Related Social Welfare Programs

Discussion leader: Gordon A. Hanson, Secretary, Christian Social Services, Board of National Ministries, Presbyterian Church in the United States, New York

Gospensors:

National Council of Churches

Presbyterian Church in the United States

Helsinki Travel Tips—the XIVth International Conference

Discussion leader: Mrs. Joe R. Hoffer, Columbus, Ohio

Sponsor: U.S. Committee of the ICSW

1:00 P.M.—1:45 P.M.

FILM THEATER

Film: Homeless Child

Sponsor: NCSW Audio-Visual Committee

1:30 P.M.

FILM THEATER

Film: The Family Plan

Sponsor: NCSW Audio-Visual Committee

2:00 P.M.—3:30 P.M.

THE STATUS OF CHILD PROTECTION: A NATIONAL ASSESSMENT

Presiding: Robert E. Jornlin, Director, Contra Costa County Social Service Department, Martinez, Calif.*Speaker:* Vincent De Francis, Director, Children's Division, American Humane Association, Denver*Discussant:* Boyd Oviatt, Associate Dean, Graduate School of Social Work, University of Denver*Cosponsors:*

American Humane Association, Children's Division

American Legion, Child Welfare Division

American Public Welfare Association, Group Meeting 1

Child Welfare League of America, Group Meeting 1

National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Group Meeting 1

PUBLIC WELFARE: RECOMMITTED,
RESTRUCTURED, REVITALIZED*Presiding:* Fedele F. Fauri, Dean, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; President, American Public Welfare Association

The Commitment

Speaker: James R. Dumpson, Dean, School of Social Service, Fordham University, New York

The Relationships

Speaker: William H. Robinson, Director, Cook County Department of Public Aid, Chicago

Sponsor: American Public Welfare Association, Group Meeting 2

ARMY COMMUNITY SERVICE: A PROFESSIONAL CHALLENGE

Presiding: Col. Ralph Morgan, Social Service Consultant, Office of the Surgeon General, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C.*Speaker:* Lt. Col. William G. Hill, Social Work Consultant, Army Community Service Program, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C.

Meeting Needs of Families Facing Rapid Relocation

Speaker: Capt. Jacob M. Romo, Instructor, Medical Field Service School, Brooke Army Medical Center, Fort Sam Houston, San Antonio, Texas

An Army Community Service Center

Speaker: John Niccum, Director, Army Community Service Center, Fort Sam Houston, San Antonio, Texas

Sponsor: Army Community Service, Headquarters, Department of the Army

WHO SPEAKS FOR CHILDREN?

Presiding: Frank H. Sloss, Esq., President, California Citizens' Adoption Committee, San Francisco

Speaker: Mrs. Trude W. Lash, Executive Director, Citizens' Committee for Children of New York, New York

Sponsor: Child Welfare League of America, Group Meeting 2

CHANGING PATTERNS IN GROUP CARE OF CHILDREN

Presiding: Sister M. Emanuel, Associate Director, Project on Physical Facilities for Group Care of Children, University of Chicago, Chicago

Speaker: Donnel M. Pappenfort, Director, Project on Physical Facilities for Group Care of Children; Associate Professor, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago, Chicago

Discussants: Charles P. Gershenson, Director, Division of Research, Children's Bureau, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Clayton E. Nordstrom, Executive Director, Fred Finch Youth Center, Oakland, Calif.

Richard O. Pancost, Executive Director, Sunny Hills, San Anselmo, Calif.; President, California Association of Executives of Children's Institutions, San Anselmo, Calif.

Cosponsors:

Child Welfare League of America, Group Meeting 3

Florence Crittenton Association of America, Group Meeting 1

HUMAN RIGHTS AS AN ORGANIZING CONCEPT IN SOCIAL WELFARE (Ann Elizabeth Neely Memorial Lecture)

Presiding: Herman D. Stein, Provost for Social and Behavioral Sciences and Dean, School of Applied Social Sciences, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland; President, Council on Social Work Education

Speaker: Wayne Vasey, Professor, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; former Dean, George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis; President, NCSW

Cosponsors:

Council on Social Work Education

NASW, Group Meeting 1

NCSW

STRENGTHS OF THE SELF-SUPPORTING POOR

Presiding: Mrs. Norman W. Shaw, Jr., Past President, Family Service Agency, Stockton, Calif.

Speaker: Mrs. Maurine LaBarre, Assistant Professor, Division of Child Psychiatry, Medical Center, Duke University, Durham, N.C.

Discussant: Mrs. Ellen P. Manser, Specialist in Family Development, Family Service Association of America, New York

Sponsor: Family Service Association of America, Group Meeting 1

SINGLE PARENT AND HER BABY: IMPLICATIONS FOR COMMUNITY ACTION

Presiding: Phyllis Dunne, member, Advisory Committee, Single Parent Project; Director of Social Services, Catholic Charities, San Francisco

Discussants: Jean Bolton, Executive Director, Florence Crittenton Home, San Francisco; Director, Single Parent Project

Jeanne Olander, social worker, Single Parent Project, San Francisco

Frank Monerief, social work research consultant

Cosponsors:

Florence Crittenton Association of America, Group Meeting 2

National Council on Illegitimacy, Group Meeting 1

WHO CARES ABOUT THE DROPOUT? WE DO, THE JOB CORPS

Presiding: Robert Young, Associate Director, Job Corps, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.

Panelists: Miles Stanley, AFL-CIO

Marion Pine, HEW Regional Office, Baltimore

Mrs. Gussey Thompson, Regional Coordinator, Western Region, WICS

Will Lewis, Center Director, Clinton Job Corps Center

Sponsor: Job Corps, Office of Economic Opportunity

EVOLVING PATTERNS FOR TRAINING HOMEMAKER-HOME HEALTH AIDS

Presiding: Hadley D. Hall, Executive Director, San Francisco Home Health Agency

Speakers: Mrs. Margaret K. Yoder, Assistant State Leader, Home Economics Program, Cooperative Extension Service, Iowa State University, Ames

Adele F. Aras, Director, Homemaker Service of Metropolitan Detroit

Recorder: Mrs. Margaret Finley, Home Economics Analyst, California Department of Social Welfare, Sacramento

Cosponsors:

American Home Economics Association

National Council for Homemaker Services

PROTECTIVE SERVICES FOR OLDER PEOPLE: IMPLICATIONS FOR PUBLIC AND VOLUNTARY AGENCIES

Presiding: Ernest F. Witte, Dean, School of Social Work, San Diego State College, San Diego, Calif.

Providing Protective Services through the Auspices of a Voluntary Casework Agency

Speaker: Agnes McRoberts, Director of Protective Services, Sheltering Arms, Houston, Texas

Providing Protective Services through the Auspices of a County Public Welfare Department

Speaker: Sally Follett, Protective Services for Aging, County of Santa Clara Welfare Department, San Jose, Calif.

Discussants: Margaret Blenkner, Director, Protective Services Research and Demonstration Project, Benjamin Rose Institute, Cleveland
Jane Garretson, Supervisor, Services for the Aged, United Charities, Chicago

Mrs. Edward R. Hughes, Staff Associate, Friendly House, Portland, Oreg.

Cosponsors:

American Public Welfare Association, Group Meeting 3

Family Service Association of America, Group Meeting ■

National Council on the Aging

National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, Group Meeting 1

The Volunteers of America, Group Meeting 1

REACHING THE UNREACHED ALCOHOLIC, WITH EMPHASIS ON LOWER SOCIOECONOMIC GROUPS

Presiding: Jack Guest, Director, Western Region Office, National Council on Alcoholism, San Francisco

Speaker: Herman E. Krimmel, Director, Cleveland Center on Alcoholism

Discussants: Richard Silver, Executive Director, Seattle Committee on Alcoholism

Mrs. Florette Pomeroy, Executive Director, San Francisco Area, National Council on Alcoholism, San Francisco

Sponsor: National Council on Alcoholism

YOUTH IN DISSENT: REBELLION

Moderator: William F. Byron, Visiting Professor, University of the Pacific, Stockton, Calif.

Cosponsors:

California Department of Corrections

California Probation, Parole, and Corrections Association

California Youth Authority

National Assembly for Social Policy and Development

National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Group Meeting 2

San Francisco Police Department

San Jose State College

ILLEGITIMACY: THE ROLES OF THE HELPING PROFESSIONS

Presiding: Maj. Mary E. Verner, Women's Social Service Secretary, Eastern Territorial Headquarters, Salvation Army, New York

The Physician's Role in Prevention and Treatment

Speaker: A. Crawford Bost, M.D., member, Committee on Maternal and Child Care, American Medical Association; Past President, American Academy of Pediatrics, Berkeley, Calif.

The Clergy's Role in Social Action

Speaker: John McDowell, Director for Social Welfare, Department of Social Justice, National Council of Churches, New York

Cosponsors:

Child Welfare League of America, Group Meeting 4

Family Service Association of America, Group Meeting 3
 Florence Crittenton Association of America, Group Meeting 3
 National Council on Illegitimacy, Group Meeting 2
 National Urban League
 Planned Parenthood-World Population
 The Salvation Army
 The Volunteers of America, Group Meeting 2

NEW PATTERNS FOR DELIVERY OF SERVICE IN NEIGHBORHOOD: A BLUEPRINT FOR HELPING NEIGHBORHOODS

Presiding: John P. Austin, attorney-at-law, Berkeley; Vice President, National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers; member, Board of Golden Gate Neighborhood Centers Association, University of California YMCA

Speaker: Margaret Berry, Executive Director, National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, New York

Panelists: Robert L. Bond, Executive Director, Greater Cleveland Neighborhood Centers Association

Theatrice Williams, Executive Director, Phyllis Wheatley Community Center, Minneapolis; member, Mayor's Committee on Urban Coalition
 Franklin I. Harbach, Executive Director, Neighborhood Center Association of Houston and Harris Counties, Houston, Texas

Sponsor: National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, Group Meeting ■

INFORMATION AND REFERRAL WORKSHOP

Presiding: Mrs. Elsie Bilsky, Project Director, Welfare Information Service, Los Angeles

Psychiatric Referrals in Depth in an Information and Referral Service Setting

Speaker: Mrs. Stephanie Pearlstein, Supervising Psychiatric Social Worker, Community Consultation Service, Harbor General Hospital, Torrance, Calif.

Discussant: Ruth P. Short, Director of Local Program, Department of Mental Hygiene, Los Angeles

Sponsor: United Community Funds and Councils of America

DYNAMIC INVOLVEMENT OF VOLUNTEERS

Presiding: Mrs. William French Smith, Board member, Los Angeles Chapter, American Red Cross

The Marginal Volunteer

Speaker: Mrs. Joel Nemschoff, Director, Volunteer Bureau of San Francisco

Family to Family

Speaker: Mrs. Gerald Winans, Director, Volunteer Bureau of Lansing, Mich.

Differential Assignment of Volunteers in the Development of New Programs

Speaker: Mrs. Eloise B. Waite, National Director, Service to Military Families, American National Red Cross, Washington, D.C.

Cosponsors:

American National Red Cross

Association of the Junior Leagues of America

United Community Funds and Councils of America—Association of Volunteer Bureaus

CHANGING ROLE OF SOCIAL AGENCIES IN
SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

Presiding: Delwin M. Anderson, Director, Social Work Service, Veterans Administration Central Office, Washington, D.C.

Speaker: Eileen Blackey, Dean, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Los Angeles

Sponsor: Veterans Administration Social Work Service

2:00 P.M.—4:15 P.M.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF PEACE AND DISARMAMENT TO THE
PRACTICE OF SOCIAL WORK: A PROFESSIONAL PROBLEM

Presiding: Ned Goldberg, Consultant, Poverty Program, National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, New York

Speakers: Maryann Mahaffy, Assistant Professor, School of Social Work, Wayne State University, Detroit

Arthur J. Katz, Associate Professor, Graduate School of Social Work, New York University, New York

Sponsor: NASW, Group Meeting 2

4:00 P.M.—5:30 P.M.

PUBLIC WELFARE: RECOMMITTED,
RESTRUCTURED, REVITALIZED

Presiding: Mark Hale, Director, Jane Addams Graduate School of Social Work, University of Illinois, Urbana; Second Vice President, American Public Welfare Association

The Problems

Speaker: Norman V. Lourie, Executive Deputy Secretary, Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, Harrisburg

The Methodologies

Speaker: Stephen P. Simonds, Commissioner, Assistance Payments Administration, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Sponsor: American Public Welfare Association

A COMMUNITY COUNCIL FOR CHILD WELFARE SERVICES

Presiding: Lt. Col. George Welton, Army Community Service Center, United States Army, Fort Knox, Ky.

Discussants: Capt. Allen R. Smith, Social Work Service, William Beaumont General Hospital, El Paso, Texas

Maj. Leonora Roberts, Army Community Service Center, United States Army, Fort Bliss, Texas

Joe H. Giles, Regional Director, Child Welfare Division, Texas Department of Public Welfare, El Paso

Sponsor: Army Community Service, Headquarters, Department of the Army

IMPACT OF SOCIETY'S VALUES ON CHILDREN AND THEIR PARENTS

Presiding: Mrs. Mayer L. B. Cohn, Board member, Vista Del Mar Child Care Services, Beverly Hills

Speaker: Isidore Ziferstein, M.D., Los Angeles

Cosponsors:

Child Welfare League of America, Group Meeting 1

Florence Crittenton Association of America, Group Meeting 1

NEW CONCEPTS OF SOCIAL WORK COMPETENCE: SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR FIELD INSTRUCTION WITHIN THE TOTAL SOCIAL WORK CURRICULUM

Presiding: Arnulf M. Pins, Executive Director, Council on Social Work Education, New York

Speaker: Mrs. Ruth Knee, Chief of Mental Health Care, Administration Branch, National Institute of Mental Health, Chevy Chase, Md.

Speaker: Mildred Sikkema, Professor, School of Social Work, University of Hawaii, Honolulu; formerly Director, Field Instruction Project, Council on Social Work Education

Discussant: Jack Stumpf, Professor, School of Social Work, San Diego State College, San Diego, Calif.

Sponsor: Council on Social Work Education

SOCIAL WORK PRACTITIONERS OF TOMORROW

Presiding: Stanley Bass, Executive Director, Jewish Family Service of Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, Oakland, Calif.

Speaker: Mary R. Baker, Director of Personnel Service, Family Service Association of America, New York

Discussants: Mrs. Dorothy Bird Daly, Division of Manpower Development and Training, Office of Research and Demonstration, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Saul Scheidlinger, Group Process Consultant, Community Service Society of New York, New York

Sponsor: Family Service Association of America, Group Meeting 1

A LEGAL APPROACH TO THE PROBLEMS OF ILLEGITIMACY

Presiding: Mrs. Henry Steeger, Chairman, National Council of Illegitimacy, New York

Speakers: Karl Zukerman, legal counsel, Community Service Society of New York, New York

William H. Robinson, Director, Cook County Department of Public Aid, Chicago

Cosponsors:

Child Welfare League of America, Group Meeting 2

Family Service Association of America, Group Meeting 2
Florence Crittenton Association of America, Group Meeting 2
National Council on Illegitimacy
National Urban League, Group Meeting 1
The Salvation Army
The Volunteers of America

POLITICS AND SOCIAL WELFARE

Presiding: Mrs. Frances Schmidt, Director of Development and Alumni Affairs, Columbia University School of Social Work, New York

Speaker: Arthur Hillman, Director, Training Center, National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, Chicago

Discussants: W. Byron Rumford, former Assemblyman and author of California Open Housing bill, Berkeley

Percy H. Steele, Jr., Executive Director, Bay Area Urban League, San Francisco

Cosponsors:

National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers

National Public Relations Council of Health and Welfare Services

ALTERING STRUCTURES TO INCLUDE PARTICIPATION OF THE PEOPLE IN POLICY-MAKING

Presiding: Mrs. Betti S. Whaley, Program Director, National Urban League, New York

Experimental Urban Leagues

Speaker: Sterling Tucker, Executive Director, Washington Urban League, Washington, D.C.

Altering Structures to Include Participation of the People in Policy-making

Speaker: Gordon Manser, Associate Director, National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, New York

Education as a System to Allow for More Parent Participation

Speaker: Laplois Ashford, Executive Director, Urban League of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y.

The Work of the National Welfare Rights Organization

Speaker: George A. Wiley, Executive Director, National Welfare Rights Organization, Washington, D.C.

Cosponsors:

National Assembly for Social Policy and Development

National Urban League, Group Meeting 2

PLANNED PARENTHOOD—YOUR QUESTIONS ANSWERED

Presiding: Mrs. Henry H. Clifford, National Board member, Planned Parenthood—World Population, Pasadena, Calif.

Panelists: William H. Grier, M.D., Director, Child Guidance Clinic, Mental Health Division, Department of Public Health, San Francisco
Donald H. Minkler, M.D., President, Planned Parenthood League of Alameda Co., Oakland, Calif.

Mrs. Elaine Wolfe, Chairman, San Francisco Planned Parenthood; mem-

ber, Social Workers Advisory Committee, San Francisco Unified School District, San Francisco

Dudley Kirk, demographer, Stanford University, Palo Alto, Calif.

Mrs. Lee Minto, Executive Director, Planned Parenthood Center of Seattle, Seattle

R. Leslie Smith, M.D., Director, U.S. Public Health Service, Region 9, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, San Francisco

Mrs. Nell Randall, Neighborhood Aide, Planned Parenthood League of Alameda County, Oakland, Calif.

Sponsor: Planned Parenthood-World Population

INFORMATION AND REFERRAL WORKSHOP

Presiding: Mrs. Thelma V. Rutherford, Director, Information and Referral Service, Health and Welfare Council of the National Capital Area, Washington, D.C.

The Information and Referral Service in a Multipurpose Service Center

Speaker: Vincent J. Doyle, Director, LEAP Community Service Center, Phoenix, Ariz.

The Training of Aides in a Multipurpose Service Center

Speaker: Mrs. Corazon E. Doyle, Director, Information and Referral Service, Community Council Serving Maricopa County, Phoenix, Ariz.

Sponsor: United Community Funds and Councils of America

DYNAMIC INVOLVEMENT OF VOLUNTEERS

Presiding: Mrs. Milo Yalich, nominee for President, Association of Junior Leagues of America, Colorado Springs, Colo.

Dropouts Anonymous

Speaker: Guy B. Farnsworth, Director, Special Broadcast Service, KFRE Station, Fresno, Calif.

PAVE: a Program for Agency and Volunteer Education

Speakers: Mrs. William C. Charles Edwards, member, Junior League of Palo Alto; former Chairman, PAVE Program

Mrs. Moffatt Hancock, Executive Director, Volunteer Bureau of North Santa Clara County, Palo Alto, Calif.

Mobile Senior Citizens' Unit

Speakers: Mrs. Alva S. Nealy, Mobile Senior Citizens' Unit, Volunteer Bureau, Los Angeles Region

Mrs. Peggy Dodge, Mobile Senior Citizens' Unit, Volunteer Bureau, Los Angeles Region

Cosponsors:

American National Red Cross

Association of the Junior Leagues of America

United Community Funds and Councils of America-Association of Volunteer Bureaus

8:30 P.M.

SOCIAL WELFARE AND THE CITIES: A TIME FOR CHANGE
(Howard F. Gustafson Memorial Lecture)

Presiding: Wayne Vasey, Professor, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; former Dean, George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis; President, NCSW

Speaker: Mitchell I. Ginsberg, Commissioner, Human Resources Administration, New York

Cosponsors:

Indianapolis Howard F. Gustafson Memorial Committee

NASW

NCSW

WEDNESDAY, MAY 29

9:00 A.M.—10:45 A.M.

GENERAL SESSION

Priorities for Social Progress

Presiding: Mrs. Jackson Chance, Executive Director, Rosenberg Foundation, San Francisco; Second Vice President, NCSW

Speaker: Leo Perlis, Director, Community Service Activities, AFL-CIO, Washington, D.C.

Speaker: Kent Mathewson, President, Metropolitan Fund, Detroit; member, New Detroit Committee

11:15 A.M.—12:45 P.M.

THE GHETTOS, THE NEW LEFT, AND THE REVOLUTIONARY FERMENT

Presiding: Roland L. Warren, Professor of Community Theory, Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.

Speaker: Tom Hayden, author, *Rebellion in Newark*, Newark, N.J.; former President, Students for a Democratic Society

Discussant: Robert Binstock, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science and Social Welfare, Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.

Sponsor: Division (cosponsored by National Assembly for Social Policy and Development and NCSW)

FAMILY PLANNING AND CASEWORK

Presiding: Mrs. Naomi T. Gray, Field Director, Planned Parenthood—World Population, New York

Speaker: Eunice M. Minton, Supervisory Social Administration Specialist, Office of the Chief, Children's Bureau, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Discussant: Nell Lipscomb, Louisiana Family Planning Program, New Orleans

Sponsor: Section I (Casework), Group Meeting 1

MULTISERVICE CENTER: AGENCY WORK AND NEIGHBORHOOD SOCIAL STRUCTURE

Presiding: Harry Tanner, Planning Associate, Community Council of Greater Dallas

Agency Work and Neighborhood Social Structure: an Attempt at Theory Construction and Testing

Speaker: Lawrence K. Northwood, Professor, School of Social Work, University of Washington, Seattle

Sponsor: Section I (Casework), Group Meeting 2

SOCIAL CASEWORK IN THE BLACK GHETTO: THE NEW COLONIALISM

Presiding: Lloyd Street, Lecturer, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley

Speaker: Henry Miller, Associate Professor, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley

Discussant: Robert Blauner, Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, University of California, Berkeley

Sponsor: Section I (Casework), Group Meeting 3

THE SOCIAL SERVICE DELIVERY AND SOCIAL WORK MANPOWER SYSTEMS: AN EXAMINATION OF THEIR INTERRELATIONSHIPS AND INTERDEPENDENCIES

Presiding: Sidney E. Zimbalist, Research Director, Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago

Speakers: Mrs. Dorothy Bird Daly, Division of Manpower Development and Training, Office of Research and Demonstration, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Elizabeth V. Thomas, Director, Intensive In-Service Training Center, State Department of Public Assistance, Seattle

Cosponsors:

Section I (Casework), Group Meeting 4

Section IV (Social Research), Group Meeting 1

WHERE THE ACTION IS (Lindeman Memorial Lecture)

Presiding: Mary E. Blake, Assistant to the Chief for Cooperative Planning, Children's Bureau, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Speaker: Ruby B. Pernell, Professor, Grace Longwell Coyle Chair in Social Work, School of Applied Social Sciences, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland

Cosponsors:

Section I (Casework), Group Meeting 5

Section II (Group Work)

DESIGNING THE SERVICE AGENCY FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING

Presiding: Gordon Berg, Executive Director, United Community Services of Charlotte, N.C.

Speaker: Violet M. Sieder, Associate Professor, Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.

Discussant: John Wedemeyer, Director, Technical Assistance Project, American Public Welfare Association, Chicago

Sponsor: Section III (Community Organization and Social Action), Group Meeting 1

ORGANIZING THE UNAFFILIATED AND THE UNEMPLOYED

Presiding: Melvin King, Executive Director, Urban League of Boston, Roxbury, Mass.

Speakers: Cesar E. Chavez, Director, United Farm Workers' Organizing Committee, AFL-CIO, Delano, Calif.

Alvin Poussaint, M.D., Tufts Medical School, Tufts University, Boston

Sponsor: Section III (Community Organization and Social Action), Group Meeting 2

A NEW BREED? A NEW FORCE IN SOCIAL WORK?

Presiding and speaker: Mrs. Ferne K. Kolodner, Social Planning Consultant, Baltimore Public Schools

Speakers: Barbara Mikulski, Assistant Chief, Community Relations, Department of Public Welfare, Baltimore

A. Sidney Johnson, Special Assistant to the Under Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Discussants: Adrain C. Bontje, Regional Welfare Officer, Department of Health and Welfare, State of Alaska, Anchorage

Jane Mathieu, Executive Director, Echo House Foundation, Baltimore

Sponsor: Section III (Community Organization and Social Action), Group Meeting 3

FATHERLESS HOMES: A REVIEW OF RESEARCH

Presiding: Leonard S. Kogan, Director, Center for Social Research, City University of New York, New York

Speaker: Elizabeth Herzog, Chief, Child Life Studies Branch, Division of Research, Children's Bureau, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Discussant: Katherine Spencer, Professor of Research, School of Social Work, Boston University

Sponsor: Section IV (Social Research), Group Meeting 2

METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIAL INDICATORS (Lindeman Memorial Lecture)

Presiding: Wayne McMillen, Director of Studies, Bay Area Social Planning Council, Oakland, Calif.

Speaker: Eleanor Bernert Sheldon, sociologist and Executive Associate, Russell Sage Foundation, New York (coauthor: Wilbert E. Moore)

Cosponsors:

Section IV (Social Research), Group Meeting 3

Section V (Administration), Group Meeting 1

THE NEW UNIONISM IN THE PROFESSIONS

Presiding: Emeric Kurtagh, Executive Director, Neighborhood Service Organization, Detroit

Speakers: Mitchell I. Ginsberg, Commissioner, Human Resources Administration, New York

Charles M. Rehmus, Professor of Political Science and Codirector, Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Discussants: Charles M. Rehmus

Martin Morgenstern, President, Social Services Employees Union, Department of Social Services, New York

Sponsor: Section V (Administration), Group Meeting 2

COMMUNICATION WITH THE GHETTO

Presiding: William T. Kirk, Executive Director, Motion Picture and Television Relief Fund, Los Angeles

Speaker: Larry Menkin, Director of Radio, Television, and Films, Community Relations Division, United Bay Area Crusade, San Francisco

Discussants: Acklin Tibeaux, street worker, Youth for Service, San Francisco

Price M. Cobbs, psychiatrist and Board member, Bay Area Urban League, San Francisco

Philip E. Ryan, Congressional Services staff, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C.

Cosponsors:

National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers

National Public Relations Council of Health and Welfare Services

NCSW Public Relations Committee

FIELDWORK AND SOCIAL PSYCHIATRY

(Albert Deutsch Memorial Lecture)

Presiding: Donald E. Brieland, Professor, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago; Secretary, NCSW

Speaker: Edgar Auerswald, M.D., psychiatrist, Gouverneur Ambulatory Service, Beth Israel Hospital, New York

Sponsor: NCSW Program Committee

11:15 A.M.

FILM THEATER

Film: Narcotics: the Inside Story

Sponsor: NCSW Audio-Visual Committee

11:30 A.M.

FILM THEATER

Film: Drugs and the Nervous System

Sponsor: NCSW Audio-Visual Committee

12 NOON

FILM THEATER

Film: LSD: Insight or Insanity?

Sponsor: NCSW Audio-Visual Committee

12:50 P.M.

LUNCH AND LEARN

Rehabilitation through the Scriptures

Sponsor: American Bible Society

The Older Person Plans His Own Future

Discussion leader: David Jeffreys, Executive Director, Field Operations and Development, American Association of Retired Persons-National Retired Teachers Association, Long Beach, Calif.

Sponsor: American Association of Retired Persons-National Retired Teachers Association

Emergency Housing and Assistance for Women and Children

Discussion leader: Joan Sparks, Executive Director, Good Samaritan Home, Oakland, Calif.

Sponsor: Good Samaritan Home

Build Membership by Using Membership Benefits

Discussion leader: Lowell Iberg, President, National Association of State-wide Health and Welfare, New York

Sponsor: National Association of Statewide Health and Welfare

Manpower: a Community Responsibility

Discussion leaders: Maxine E. Miller, Assistant Executive Director, Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago
Margaret E. Adams, Director, Professional Standards, National Association of Social Workers, New York

Sponsor: National Commission for Social Work Careers

A Significant Educational Resource: the NCSW Service of Selected Bibliographies and Microfilms

Discussion leader: Arthur J. Katz, Associate Professor, Graduate School of Social Work, New York University, New York

Sponsor: NCSW

Arranging Meetings

Discussion leader: Guichard Parris, Director of Public Relations, National Urban League, New York

Sponsor: NCSW

New York State Social Work Career Ladder

Discussion leader: Donald Hanson, Assistant Director of Personnel, Department of Mental Hygiene, Albany, N.Y.

Sponsor: New York State Department of Mental Hygiene

Social Planning for San Francisco's Urban Renewal Program

Discussion leader: Mrs. Julia B. Smith, Assistant Director, Planning and Programing, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

Sponsor: San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

Career Opportunities in Church-Related Social Agencies

Discussion leader: Helen E. Irvine, Administrator, Personnel Referral Service, National Presbyterian Health and Welfare Association, New York

Cosponsors:

United Church of Christ

United Presbyterian Church

Changing Anti-Negro Attitudes and Behavior in the White Community

Discussion leader: Robert W. Goldfarb, Executive Director, American Council for Nationalities, New York

1:00 P.M.—1:45 P.M.

FILM THEATER

Film: A Bridge to Adoption

Sponsor: NCSW Audio-Visual Committee

1:30 P.M.

FILM THEATER

Film: Behind the Scenes

Sponsor: NCSW Audio-Visual Committee

2:00 P.M.—3:30 P.M.

PANEL: THE WAR ON POVERTY—A POLITICAL ASSESSMENT

Presiding: Thomas D. Sherrard, Director, Urban Development Institute, Purdue University, Hammond, Ind.

From the Standpoint of Intervention Methods

Panelist: Alvin L. Schorr, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Individual and Family Services, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

From the Standpoint of Politics

Panelist: William H. Robinson, Director, Cook County Department of Public Aid, Chicago

From the Standpoint of Types of Local Participants

Panelist: Ralph Segalman, Associate Professor of Social Work, University of Texas, Austin

From the Standpoint of Race

Panelist: John B. Turner, Associate Dean, School of Applied Social Sciences, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland

From the Standpoint of Labor

Panelist: Melvin A. Glasser, Director, Social Security Department, United Auto Workers, Detroit

Sponsor: Division (cosponsored by National Assembly for Social Policy and Development and NCSW)

CURRENT SOCIAL SCIENCE CONCEPTS TO APPLY IN WORKING WITH THE AGING

Presiding: Joseph Kuypers, Acting Assistant Professor, Institute of Human Development, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley

Speaker: Irma Stein, Professor, Department of Social Welfare, San Francisco State College

Sponsor: Section I (Casework), Group Meeting 1

DIFFERENTIAL PLANNING AND DELIVERY OF CASEWORK SERVICE IN PUBLIC WELFARE

Presiding: Virginia L. Tannar, Staff Development Specialist, Children's Bureau, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Speakers: Betty Presley, Executive Director, Marin County Department of Public Social Services, San Rafael, Calif.

Stephen Simonds, Administrator for Assistance Payments Administration, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Sponsor: Section I (Casework), Group Meeting 2

EXTENDING SERVICES THROUGH THE USE OF VOLUNTEERS

Presiding: Mrs. Marion R. Kelley, Executive Director, Volunteer Bureau of Marin, San Rafael, Calif.

Speakers: John S. Reynolds, Director, Downriver Child Guidance Clinic, Lincoln Park, Mich.

Mrs. Marjorie Schumacher, Executive Director, Planned Parenthood of Metropolitan Washington, Washington, D.C.

Sponsor: Section I (Casework), Group Meeting 3

MULTISERVICE CENTER: ITS IMPACT ON TRADITIONAL METHODS OF PRACTICE

Presiding: Bernard Goldstein, Executive Director, Jewish Family Service, Dallas

Speakers: Harry Tanner, Planning Associate, Community Council of Greater Dallas, Dallas

Martin Ortiz, Consultant to the Service Center Program, State of California, Pasadena

Sponsor: Section I (Casework), Group Meeting 4

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR SOCIAL WORK IN SCHOOLS

Presiding: Herbert E. Chamberlain, M.D., consulting psychiatrist, Sacramento, Calif.

Speakers: Norman L. Wyers, school social worker, Child Resource Teacher Project, Jackson County Intermediate Education District, Medford, Oreg.

Mrs. Myra S. Miller, Social Work Coordinator, Child Resource Teacher Project, Jackson County Intermediate Education District, Medford, Oreg.
Richard Bolton, social worker, Child Resource Teacher Project, Jackson County Intermediate Education District, Salem, Oreg.

Discussant: William H. Gilbertson, Training Specialist, Washington State Department of Institutions, Tacoma

Sponsor: Section I (Casework), Group Meeting 5

PUTTING THE GROUP BACK IN GROUP WORK

Presiding: Ralph Ormsby, Executive Director, Family Service of Philadelphia

Speaker: Emanuel Tropp, Associate Professor, School of Social Work, Richmond Professional Institute, Richmond, Va.

Sponsor: Section II (Group Work), Group Meeting 1

SOCIAL GROUP WORKERS' CONTRIBUTION TO THE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL

Presiding: Lulu Belle Clarke, psychiatric social worker, Day Treatment Center, San Mateo, Calif.

Speaker: Minnie Harlow, Chief Social Group Worker, Menninger Clinic, Topeka

Discussant: Hans S. Falck, Professor, School of Social Work, University of Maryland, Baltimore

Sponsor: Section II (Group Work), Group Meeting 2

THE INTEGRATION OF WORK WITH INDIVIDUALS, GROUPS, AND FAMILIES IN A DELINQUENCY PREVENTION PROGRAM IN WATTS

Presiding: Billy J. Tidwell

Speaker: Ellen A. Dunbar, Director of Training and Services, Special Service for Groups, Los Angeles

Sponsor: Section II (Group Work), Group Meeting 3

A SOCIAL WORKER IN "HIPPIELAND"

Presiding: Henry B. Ollendorff, Secretary General, Council of International Programs for Youth Leaders and Social Workers, Cleveland

Speakers: David Crystal, Executive Director, Jewish Family Service Agency, San Francisco

Irwin Gold, Executive Director, San Francisco Center, United Jewish Community Centers

Discussant: Mrs. Paula Dromi, social worker, Special Service for Groups, Los Angeles

Cosponsors:

Section I (Casework), Group Meeting 6

Section II (Group Work), Group Meeting 4

INTRODUCING A GENERIC APPROACH IN A DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WORK

Presiding: Mrs. Mary B. Davis, Chief Social Worker, Langley-Porter Neuropsychiatric Institute, San Francisco

Speakers: Abraham Lurie, Director, Department of Social Work, Hillside Hospital, Glen Oaks, New York

Joseph A. Giordano, Supervisor, Department of Social Work, Hillside Hospital, Glen Oaks, New York

Cosponsors:

Section I (Casework), Group Meeting 7

Section II (Group Work), Group Meeting 5

COUNCILS ON THE MOVE INTO ACTION AND CONTROVERSY

Presiding: Duane W. Beck, Executive Director, Community Council of the Atlanta Area, Atlanta, Ga.

Councils, 1968 Style: Action Planning

Speaker: Owen R. Davison, Executive Director, Health and Welfare Council, Philadelphia

The Council Movement Today: Revival for Survival

Speaker: Joseph E. Klug, Executive Director, United Community Services, Omaha, Nebr.

Discussant: Alvin E. Echols, Jr., Executive Director, North City Congress, Philadelphia

Sponsor: Section III (Community Organization and Social Action), Group Meeting 1

THE RIOT PHENOMENA: IMPLICATIONS FOR
COMMUNITY PLANNING

Presiding: Alex Rosen, Dean, School of Social Work, New York University, New York

The Riots of 1967: the National Advisory Commission Report

Speaker: Norville Smith, Deputy Regional Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, San Francisco

A Critique of the National Advisory Commission Report

Speaker: Joseph D. Lohman, Dean, School of Criminology, University of California, Berkeley

Discussant: Nathan E. Cohen, Professor of Social Welfare and Dean-elect, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Los Angeles; Past President, NCSW

Sponsor: Section III (Community Organization and Social Action), Group Meeting 2

STRATEGIES FOR CHANGE IN COMMUNITY ORGANIZING

Presiding: Charles Grosser, Associate Professor of Social Work, School of Social Work, New York University, New York

The Use of Bargaining

Coauthors: George Brager, Associate Professor, Columbia University School of Social Work, New York

Mrs. Valerie Jorin, Director, Special Community Programs, Housing and Development Administration, City of New York

Tactics of Disruption

Speaker: Harry Specht, Lecturer, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley

Sponsor: Section III (Community Organization and Social Action), Group Meeting 3

THE WORK POTENTIAL OF AFDC MOTHERS: A RESEARCH SYNTHESIS

Presiding: John Wedemeyer, Director, Technical Assistance Project, American Public Welfare Association, Chicago

Speaker: Genevieve W. Carter, Chief, Division of Intramural Research, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Discussants: Norman V. Lourie, Executive Deputy Secretary, Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, Harrisburg

Paul H. Glasser, Professor, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Cosponsors:

Section I (Casework), Group Meeting 8

Section IV (Social Research), Group Meeting 1

A COMPREHENSIVE FOSTER CARE RESEARCH PROGRAM

Presiding: Donald E. Brieland, Professor, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago; Secretary, NCSW

Introduction and Characteristics of Children

Speaker: David Fanshel, Program Director, Child Welfare Research Program, Columbia University School of Social Work, New York

The Families of the Children in Care

Speaker: Shirley Jenkins, Associate Program Director, Child Welfare Research Program, Columbia University School of Social Work, New York

The Entry of Children into Care

Speaker: Eugene B. Shinn, Study Director, Child Welfare Research Program, Columbia University School of Social Work, New York

The Agencies Serving the Children

Speaker: Deborah Shapiro, Study Director, Child Welfare Research Program, Columbia University School of Social Work, New York

Cosponsors:

Section I (Casework), Group Meeting 9

Section IV (Social Research), Group Meeting 2

TECHNOLOGIES AND THE ADMINISTRATOR

Presiding: Ronald H. Born, General Manager, Department of Social Services, San Francisco

Speakers: Gerald Miller, Chief, Research Division, Bureau of the Budget, State of Michigan, Lansing

Joseph L. Farrell, Associate Director, Michigan Department of Social Service, Lansing

Cosponsors:

Section IV (Social Research), Group Meeting 3

Section V (Administration)

BUSINESS AND SOCIAL WELFARE:

NEW PATTERNS AND NEW PERSPECTIVES

Presiding: Mortimer Fleishhacker, Jr., Chairman of the Board, Precision

Instrument Co.; President, Bay Area Social Planning Council, San Francisco

Speaker: John W. Riley, Jr., Vice President and Director, Social Research Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States

Discussant: C. F. McNeil, Executive Director, National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, New York; Chairman, NCSW Public Relations and Development Committee

Sponsor: NCSW Public Relations Committee

INTERNATIONAL RECIPROCITY IN SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION AND PRACTICE

Presiding: Katherine A. Kendall, Director of International Education, Council on Social Work Education, New York; Secretary General, International Association of Schools of Social Work

Panelists: Gloria Abate, Director, School of Social Service, University of San Marcos, Lima, Peru; scholar in residence, Columbia University School of Social Work, New York

E. Q. Blavo, Lecturer, Social Administration Section, Sociology Department, University of Ghana, Legon, Ghana; student, Columbia University School of Social Work, New York

Emma Fasolo, Lecturer, Graduate School of Social Work, Rutgers—the State University, New Brunswick, N.J.; previously social work educator and administrator in Italy

K. Mukundarao, Associate Professor, Raymond A. Kent School of Social Work, University of Louisville, Louisville, Ky.; formerly social work educator in India

Cosponsors:

Council on Social Work Education

U.S. Committee of ICSW

4:00 P.M.—5:30 P.M.

THE POWER OF COMMUNICATION

Presiding: Wayne Vasey, Professor, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; former Dean, George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis; President, NCSW

Speaker: Joe R. Hoffer, Executive Secretary, National Conference on Social Welfare, Columbus, Ohio

Panelists: Joseph P. Anderson, Executive Director, National Association of Social Workers, New York

C. F. McNeil, Executive Director, National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, New York; Chairman, NCSW Public Relations and Development Committee

Arnulf M. Pins, Executive Director, Council on Social Work Education, New York

Samuel Martz, Assistant Administrator for Program Planning, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Sponsor: NCSW

8:30 P.M.

GENERAL SESSION

Legal Rights for All

Presiding: Richard J. Clendenen, Professor of Criminal Law and Administration, Law School, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis; Third Vice President, NCSW

Speaker: The Hon. Ramsey Clark, Attorney General of the United States, Washington, D.C.

THURSDAY, MAY 30

9:00 A.M.—10:45 A.M.

CHANGING PATTERNS IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE IMMIGRATION:
SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Presiding: Mrs. Ruth Z. Murphy, Executive Vice President, American Immigration and Citizenship Conference, New York

Immigration of Live-in Domestic Workers from the Caribbean: Problems of Social Protection

Speaker: Wells C. Klein, General Director, International Social Service, American Branch, New York

Cuban Refugees in the United States: Guidelines for Effective Rehabilitation

Speaker: John F. Thomas, Director, Cuban Refugee Program, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Mexican Immigration and Family Reunion

Speaker: Melvin B. Sherman, Executive Director, International Institute of Los Angeles

Sponsor: American Immigration and Citizenship Conference

RECENT DOCTORAL STUDIES

Presiding: Lt. Col. Leslie J. Shellhase, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, Department of the Army, Personnel Research Division, Washington, D.C.

Ego-Ideal and Clinical Activity

Speaker: Maj. Donald R. Bardill, Assistant Chief, Social Work Service, Walter Reed General Hospital, Washington, D.C.

Health and Welfare Utilization Patterns of a Military Population

Speaker: Maj. Joseph J. Bevilacqua, Medical Field Service School Facility, Brooke General Hospital, San Antonio, Texas

The Significance of the Subcultures Caretaking System among Separated Army Families

Speaker: Maj. Frank F. Montalvo, Assistant Chief, Social Work Service, Letterman General Hospital, San Francisco

Sponsor: Army Community Service, Headquarters, Department of the Army

TAKE A LOOK AND MAKE SOME CHANGES

Presiding: Mrs. Mortimer Fleishhacker, Jr., First Vice President, Camp Fire Girls, San Francisco

Speakers: Helen Rowe, Director of Research and Experimentation, Camp Fire Girls, New York

Janet Murray, Director of Special Services, Division of Field Services, Camp Fire Girls, New York

Dorothy E. Swinburne, Consultant, Health, Welfare, and Recreation, Association of the Junior Leagues of America, New York

Alice Harding, Senior Consultant, Mental Health Services and Standards, Community Mental Health Board, New York

Cosponsors:

Association of the Junior Leagues of America

United Community Funds and Councils of America—Association of Volunteer Bureaus

STRATEGY FOR SOCIAL ACTION

Presiding: Mrs. Carol Sibley, immediate Past President, California Association for Health and Welfare, Berkeley

Speaker: James D. Lorenz, Jr., Director, California Rural Legal Assistance Program, Los Angeles

Sponsor: California Association for Health and Welfare

SYSTEMS APPROACH TO MANAGING WELFARE PROGRAMS

Presiding: Edward E. Schwartz, Professor, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago, Chicago

Speaker: Robert Elkin, Director, Project on Child Welfare Costs, School of Government and Public Administration, American University, Washington, D.C.

Discussants: Frank Newgent, Director, Division for Children and Youth, Wisconsin Department of Health and Social Services, Madison

Harold W. DeMuth, Assistant Director, Community Council of Greater New York, New York

Cosponsors:

Child Welfare League of America, Group Meeting 1

Family Service Association of America, Group Meeting 1

Travelers Aid Association of America

OUR YOUNG PEOPLE SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES

Moderator: Marie Fielder, Director, Leadership Training Institute, Graduate Internship Program in Teacher Education, University of California, Berkeley

Reactor: J. Paul Dowdall, Director, Social Service Programs, San Francisco Department of Social Services

Cosponsors:

Child Welfare League of America, Group Meeting 2

Florence Crittenton Association of America, Group Meeting 1

National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, Group Meeting 1

PREPARATION FOR SOCIAL WELFARE EMPLOYMENT:
IMPLICATIONS FOR UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION
AND AGENCY TRAINING PROGRAMS

Presiding: Dan O'Keefe, Director, School of Social Work, University of Houston, Houston, Texas

Speaker: Frank M. Loewenberg, Consultant on Undergraduate Education, Council on Social Work Education, New York

Discussants: Margaret Ryan, Assistant Chief, Division of Training, Rehabilitation Service Administration, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Myron R. Chevlin, Assistant Executive Director, Child Welfare League of America, New York

Sponsor: Council on Social Work Education

FAMILY SERVICE AGENCIES AND MENTAL HEALTH CLINICS—SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES

Presiding: Portia Bell Hume, M.D., Director, Center for Training in Community Psychiatry, Berkeley, Calif.

Speakers: Mildred K. Wagle, Director of Mental Health Activities, Family Service Association of America, New York

Joseph Lehmann, Consultant, Community Clinics, Illinois Department of Mental Health, Chicago

Sponsor: Family Service Association of America, Group Meeting 2

ORGANIZATION OF FARM WORKERS: IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIAL WELFARE

Presiding: John McDowell, Director for Social Welfare, Department of Social Justice, National Council of Churches, New York

Speaker: Larry Itliong, Assistant Director, United Farmworkers Organizing Committee

Cosponsors:

AFL-CIO Community Service Activities

Executive Council, Episcopal Church

National Council of Churches, Committee on Social Welfare

National Presbyterian Health and Welfare Association

IMPACT OF COURT DECISION ON SOCIAL WORK WITH ALCOHOLIC OFFENDER

Presiding: James M. Karls, Community Organization Specialist, Division of Local Programs, Department of Mental Hygiene, San Francisco

Speaker: Donald Goff, General Secretary, American Correctional Association, New York

Discussants: Bernard Bradman, M.D., Assistant Program Chief, Department of Public Health, Community Mental Health Services, San Francisco

Richard Mayers, Justice Department, Attorney General's Office, Sacramento, Calif.

Sponsor: National Council on Alcoholism

CHILDREN IN DOUBLE JEOPARDY: THE OUT-OF-WEDLOCK CHILD AND PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Presiding: Rev. Philip A. Jarmack, Associate Secretary, National Conference of Catholic Charities, Washington, D.C.

Speakers: Mrs. Gertrude Leyendecker, Senior Associate, Bureau of Family Services, Community Service Society of New York, New York
Betty Johnson, Supervisor, Division of Services for Children and Youth, Denver Department of Welfare, Denver

Cosponsors:

Child Welfare League of America, Group Meeting 3
Family Service Association of America, Group Meeting 3
Florence Crittenton Association of America, Group Meeting 2
National Council on Illegitimacy
National Urban League
The Salvation Army
The Volunteers of America

CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES AND THE LAW

Presiding: Irving Fellner, Regional Foster Care Consultant, Children's Bureau, Denver

Speaker: Thomas T. Becker, Executive Director, New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, New York

Discussant: Hon. William S. Fort, President, National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, Eugene, Oreg.

Cosponsors:

American Humane Association, Children's Division
American Legion, Child Welfare Division
American Public Welfare Association, Group Meeting 1
Child Welfare League of America, Group Meeting 1
National Council on Crime and Delinquency

ARMY COMMUNITY SERVICE AND THE VOLUNTEER

Presiding: Lt. Col. Edward F. Krise, Army Community Service Consultant, Army Command, Fort Monroe, Va.

The Volunteer Handbook Project

Speaker: Daniel Thursz, Dean, School of Social Work, University of Maryland, Baltimore

The Role of the Volunteer in Army Community Service

Speaker: Mrs. George S. Patton, Volunteer Supervisor, Fort Myer, Va.

Sponsor: Army Community Service, Headquarters, Department of the Army

ARE ADOPTION PRACTICES KEEPING PACE WITH THE TIMES?

Presiding: Clyde Getz, Executive Director, Children's Home Society of California, Los Angeles

Speaker: Kenneth W. Watson, Director of Foster Care and Adoption, Chicago Child Care Society

Discussant: Walter A. Heath, Director, County of Los Angeles Department of Adoptions, Los Angeles

Sponsor: Child Welfare League of America, Group Meeting 2

VOLUNTEERS AND PROFESSIONALS AS PARTNERS
IN PUBLIC WELFARE

Presiding: Mrs. Alexander B. Ripley, Secretary of the Board, Child Wel-

fare League of America, Los Angeles; President, Association of Volunteer Bureaus of America, United Community Funds and Councils of America
 Why Does Public Welfare Need Volunteers?

Speaker: Mrs. Cynthia Nathan, Director, Office of Citizen Participation, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Panelists: Toni A. Palladino, Master of Public Health, Mental Health Educator, North County Mental Health Center, San Mateo, Calif.

John Dabney, psychiatric social worker, North County Mental Health Center, San Mateo, Calif.

Mrs. Howard Stegman, Chairman of Volunteers, North County Mental Health Center, San Mateo, Calif.

Warren Spencer, Supervisor, Foster Home Licensing, Department of Public Health and Welfare, San Mateo, Calif.

Mrs. Robert Frank, Assistance League of San Mateo County, Calif.

Mrs. Mary Connolly

Mrs. Lewellyn Kumetat

Mrs. Frederick Kett

Miss Billie Jo Rainen

Mrs. Hartley Cravens

Mrs. William Kennedy, volunteer, Foster Home Committee, Los Angeles Department of Public Services

Cosponsors:

American Public Welfare Association, Group Meeting 2

Association of Junior Leagues of America

Child Welfare League of America, Group Meeting 3

National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, Group Meeting 1

United Community Funds and Councils of America—Association of Volunteer Bureaus

FAMILY MONEY MANAGEMENT AND CREDIT COUNSELING

Presiding: George D. Nickel, President, Consumer Credit Counselors of California; Director of Consumer Education, Beneficial Management Corporation of America, Arcadia, Calif.

Credit Counseling and Debt-Adjustment Programs

Speaker: Perry B. Hall, Assistant Director, National Study Service, New York

Consumer Behavior and the Meanings of Money

Speaker: Mrs. Frances L. Feldman, Professor of Social Work, School of Social Work, University of Southern California, Los Angeles; Board member, Consumer Credit Counselors of California; author, *Family in a Money World*; coauthor, *Family Social Welfare*

Cosponsors:

American Home Economic Association

Family Service Association of America, Group Meeting 1

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT—WHITHER BOUND?

Presiding: Albert Comanor, Professor of Social Work Education and

Faculty Coordinator, Graduate Department of Social Work Education, San Francisco State College

Speaker: Arthur Dunham, Visiting Professor, School of Social Work, Fresno State College, Fresno, Calif.; Regional Vice President, International Society for Community Development

Discussant: Martha Branscombe, Deputy Chief, Refugee and Social Welfare Division, Bureau for Vietnam, Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C.

Sponsor: International Society for Community Development

THE NEW NATIONAL ASSEMBLY FOR SOCIAL POLICY AND DEVELOPMENT

Presiding: Wayne Vasey, Professor, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; former Dean, George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis; President, NCSW

Speaker: C. F. McNeil, Executive Director, National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, New York; Chairman, NCSW Public Relations and Development Committee

Sponsor: National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, Group Meeting 2

STATE CONFERENCES: EMERGING PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES (Workshop)

Presiding: Joe R. Hoffer, Executive Secretary, NCSW, Columbus, Ohio

Panelists: Mrs. Tina G. Howell, Executive Director, Massachusetts Conference on Social Welfare, Boston

Bert Shulimson, Executive Secretary, Missouri Association for Social Welfare, Jefferson City

James F. Dinsmore, Executive Director, Social Planning Council of Santa Clara County, Santa Clara, Calif.

Sponsor: National Association for Statewide Health and Welfare

IMPLICATIONS OF P.L. 90-248 FOR HOMEMAKER-HOME HEALTH AIDE SERVICE

Presiding: Mrs. Betty H. Andersen, Executive Director, National Council for Homemaker Services, New York

Speaker: Eunice M. Minton, Supervisory Social Administration Specialist, Office of the Chief, Children's Bureau, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Recorder: Zalia A. Kennedy, Supervisor of Homemaker Services, Catholic Social Service of San Francisco

Sponsor: National Council for Homemaker Services

REACHING THE ELDERLY POOR THROUGH PROJECT FIND: IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE IN VOLUNTARY AND PUBLIC AGENCIES

Presiding: Jack Ossofsky, Associate Director, National Council on the Aging, New York

Speaker: Genevieve Blatt, Assistant Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.

Discussants: Ismael Dieppa, Executive Director, Economic Opportunity Commission of Santa Cruz County, Watsonville, Calif.

Mrs. Margaret Newcombe, Director, Extended Services Project, Council on Aging for Seattle and King Counties, Seattle

Maurice Jones, Assistant Director, Muskogee County Community Action Foundation, Muskogee, Okla.

Cosponsors:

American Public Welfare Association, Group Meeting 3

Family Service Association of America, Group Meeting 2

National Council on the Aging

National Urban League, Group Meeting 1

The Volunteers of America, Group Meeting 1

**AN ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG-ABUSE PROGRAM
DESIGNED TO MEET COMMUNITY NEEDS**

Presiding: James Davidson, Executive Director, Alcoholism Council of Greater Los Angeles

Speaker: Wayne Wilson, Director, Alcoholic and Drug-Abuse Services, Mendocino State Hospital, Mendocino, Calif.

Discussants: Andrew H. Curry, Adult In-Patient Service, Langley-Porter Neuropsychiatric Institute, San Francisco

Dr. Arthur Carfagni, Jr., Immediate Psychiatric Aid Center, San Francisco General Hospital

Sponsor: National Council on Alcoholism

RESEARCH ON THE UNMARRIED PARENT

Presiding: Mignon Sauber, Director of Research, Community Council of Greater New York, New York

Speakers: Jerome D. Pauker, Associate Professor of Medical Psychology, University of Missouri, Columbia

Lucille J. Grow, Consultant, Child Welfare League of America, New York

Cosponsors:

Child Welfare League of America, Group Meeting 4

Family Service Association of America, Group Meeting 3

Florence Crittenton Association of America

National Council on Illegitimacy

National Urban League, Group Meeting 2

The Salvation Army

The Volunteers of America, Group Meeting 2

12:30 P.M.—3:30 P.M.

**SOCIAL SERVICES AND THE IMMIGRANT TODAY, WITH A
SPECIAL LOOK AT THE CHINESE NEWCOMER**

Moderator: The Hon. Harry W. Low, Judge, San Francisco Municipal Court

The United States and Immigration: an Historical Perspective

Panelist: Mark Zborowski, staff anthropologist, Mt. Zion Hospital, San Francisco

The Immigration Picture in 1968

Panelist: Robert W. Goldfarb, Executive Director, American Council for Nationalities Service, New York

The Chinese New Arrival: a Portrait of His Problems, Needs, and Aspirations

Panelists: Mrs. May Huie Wilson, social worker, International Institute of San Francisco

Stanley Wang, M.D., Medical Director, Psychiatric Services, St. Francis Hospital, San Francisco

Community Programs Serving the Chinese New Arrival

Panelist: Alan S. Wong, Director, Inner City Adolescent Project, YMCA, San Francisco

Cosponsors:

American Council for Nationalities Service

International Social Service, American Branch

12:50 P.M.

LUNCH AND LEARN

Rehabilitation through the Scriptures

Sponsor: American Bible Society

Effective Programs Serving Physically and Mentally Handicapped Boys

Discussion leader: Ray W. Sweazey, Director, Urban Relations Service, Boy Scouts of America, New Brunswick, N.J.

Sponsor: Boy Scouts of America

Use of Church Resources in Urban Crisis

Discussion leader: Leon Modeste, Acting Director, General Convention Special Program (Crises in American Life), Executive Council, Episcopal Church, New York

Sponsor: Executive Council, Episcopal Church

Career Opportunities in Church-Related Social Welfare

Discussion leader: Henry J. Whiting, Secretary for Social Research and Planning, Lutheran Council in the U.S.A., New York

Cosponsors:

The Lutheran Council

The Methodist Church

Manpower—a Community Responsibility

Discussion leaders: Mrs. Ella Reid, Director, Social Work Careers, Bay Area Social Planning Council, Oakland, Calif.

Mrs. Cathryn S. Guyler, Director, National Commission for Social Work Careers, New York

Sponsor: National Commission for Social Work Careers

Meeting Evaluation Techniques

Discussion leader: Joe R. Hoffer, Executive Secretary, NCSW, Columbus, Ohio

Sponsor: NCSW

Organizing News Conferences and News Rooms

Discussion leader: Mrs. Frances Schmidt, Director of Public Relations and Development, Columbia University School of Social Work, New York

Sponsor: NCSW

How to Use Film

Discussion leader: Winston Q. Siler, Vice President, Association Films, Hayward, Calif.

Sponsor: NCSW Audio-Visual Committee

New York State Social Work Career Ladder

Discussion leader: Donald Hanson, Assistant Director of Personnel, Department of Mental Hygiene, Albany, N.Y.

Sponsor: New York State Department of Mental Hygiene

Mailing Problems

Discussion leader: Bruce Sims, District Manager, Scriptomatic, Oakland, Calif.

Sponsor: Scriptomatic Addresses from a Card, Philadelphia

1:15 P.M.

THE REVOLUTION IN HUMAN VALUES: A CHALLENGE TO SOCIAL WORKERS

Presiding: Mamie Davis, Project Director, Job Corps, YWCA, New York
Speaker: Michael Novak, Assistant Professor of Humanities, Stanford University, Palo Alto, Calif.; author of several books, including *Belief and Unbelief*, and articles in *Commonweal*, *New Republic*, *Harper's*, *The Nation*, *Christian Century*

Sponsor: YWCA of the U.S.A.

2:00 P.M.—3:30 P.M.

THE LAW AND LEGAL RIGHTS OF CHILDREN AND PARENTS

Presiding: Mrs. Bartlett B. Heard, member, National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, Berkeley, Calif.

Speaker: The Hon. John G. Veneman, Assemblyman, California Legislature, Sacramento

Discussant: Mrs. Estelle Dooley, Public Defender, San Francisco

Cosponsors:

American Humane Association, Children's Division

Child Welfare League of America, Group Meeting 1

Florence Crittenton Association of America, Group Meeting 1

National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Group Meeting 1

TEACHING AS A CAREER IN SOCIAL WORK

Presiding: Rex A. Skidmore, Dean, Graduate School of Social Work, University of Utah, Salt Lake City

Speaker: Richard Lodge, Dean, School of Social Work, Richmond Professional Institute, Richmond, Va.

Discussant: Victoria Olds, Consultant on Recruitment and Preparation of New Faculty, Council on Social Work Education, New York

Sponsor: Council on Social Work Education, Group Meeting 1

PLANNED SHORT-TERM TREATMENT: VIRTUE OR NECESSITY?

Presiding: Clark W. Blackburn, General Director, Family Service Association of America, New York

Speaker: Howard J. Parad, Dean, Smith College School of Social Work, Northampton, Mass.; Director, Project on Time-limited Crisis Intervention, Family Service Association of America

Outcomes in Planned Short-Term Treatment

Speaker: Mrs. Libbie G. Parad, Research Associate, Project on Time-limited Crisis Intervention, Family Service Association of America, Northampton, Mass.

Sponsor: Family Service Association of America, Group Meeting 1

MANPOWER: A COMMUNITY RESPONSIBILITY

Presiding: Emanuel Berlatsky, Chairman, National Commission for Social Work Careers, New York

Speaker: Leah E. Parker, Field Representative, National Commission for Social Work Careers, New York

Panelists: Owen R. Davison, Executive Director, Health and Welfare Council, Philadelphia

James R. Dumpson, Dean, School of Social Service, Fordham University, New York

Robert Mighell, President, Social Work Careers in Oregon, Portland

Mrs. Virginia M. Smyth, Regional Commissioner, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Atlanta, Ga.

Cosponsors:

Council on Social Work Education, Group Meeting 2

NASW, Group Meeting 1

National Commission for Social Work Careers

YOUTH IN DISSENT: WITHDRAWAL

Moderator: Joel Fort, M.D., faculty member, San Francisco State College

Panelists: Students from the University of the Pacific, wards of the California Youth Authority, and adult panelists

Cosponsors:

California Department of Corrections

California Probation, Parole, and Corrections Association

California Youth Authority

National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, Group Meeting 1

National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Group Meeting 2

San Francisco Police Department

San Jose State College

GROUP COUNSELING AND GROUP THERAPY WITH UNMARRIED PARENTS

Presiding: Marjorie Montelius, Executive Director, Travelers Aid Society, San Francisco

Speaker: Norman Roulet, M.D., Consultant Psychiatrist, Booth-Talbert Clinic, the Salvation Army, Cleveland

Group Services for Teen-age Mothers Who Keep Their Children

Speaker: Mrs. Arletta Dawdy, staff member, Los Guillocos School for Girls, Sebastopol, Calif.

Cosponsors:

Child Welfare League of America, Group Meeting 2

Family Service Association of America, Group Meeting 2

Florence Crittenton Association of America, Group Meeting 2

National Council on Illegitimacy

National Urban League, Group Meeting 1

The Salvation Army

The Volunteers of America

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON CIVIL DISORDERS TO THE SOCIAL WELFARE FIELD

Presiding: Mrs. Juanita Dudley, Assistant Director, Western Region, National Urban League, Los Angeles

Speaker: William H. Robinson, Director, Cook County Department of Public Aid, Chicago

Discussants: Seaton W. Manning, Professor, School of Social Work, San Francisco State College

Percy H. Steele, Jr., Executive Director, Bay Area Urban League, San Francisco

Johnny E. Parham, Jr., Program Consultant, National Urban League, New York

Sponsor: National Urban League, Group Meeting 2

THE USE OF GOVERNMENT GRANTS BY THE VOLUNTARY AGENCY

Presiding: Mrs. J. W. R. Drummond, President, Volunteer Bureau of Montreal

Speaker: C. F. McNeil, Executive Director, National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, New York; Chairman, NCSW Public Relations and Development Committee

Discussants: Maxine E. Miller, Assistant Executive Director for Central Services, Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago

Rhoda M. Andersen, Executive Director, Volunteer Bureau, Los Angeles Region

Sponsor: United Community Funds and Councils of America—Association of Volunteer Bureaus

UPWARD BOUND AND TEACHING THE DISADVANTAGED

Presiding: Robert Christin, Director, Educational Associates, Inc., con-

tract agency to the Office of Economic Opportunity for Upward Bound, Washington, D.C.

Discussants: Project directors of various Upward Bound projects

Cosponsors:

Educational Associates, Inc. (contract agency to the Office of Economic Opportunity for Upward Bound)

Upward Bound (Office of Economic Opportunity)

2:00 P.M.—5:30 P.M.

WORKSHOP ON THE USE OF THE ADOPTION RESOURCE EXCHANGE OF NORTH AMERICA

Presiding: Clara J. Swan, Director, Adoption Resource Exchange of North America, Child Welfare League of America, New York

Sponsor: Child Welfare League of America, Group Meeting 3

2:00 P.M.—3:00 P.M.

HOW TO DO IT (Workshop on Social Action and Social Change)

Cochairmen: Mrs. Ferne K. Kolodner, Social Planning Consultant, Baltimore Public Schools

Sanford Kravitz, Associate Professor of Social Planning, Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.

The Arsenal of Social Action Strategies: Options for Social Welfare

Speaker: Daniel Thursz, Dean, School of Social Work, University of Maryland, Baltimore

Cosponsors:

National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, Group Meeting 2

National Association for Statewide Health and Welfare

NASW, Group Meeting 2

Section III (Community Organization and Social Action)

3:15 P.M.—5:30 P.M.

LEGISLATIVE ACTION AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL

(Workshop Session 1)

Presiding: Charles I. Schottland, Dean, Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.

Speaker: Leon Ginsberg, School of Social Work, University of Oklahoma, Norman

Cosponsors:

National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, Group Meeting 1

National Association for Statewide Health and Welfare, Group Meeting 1

NASW, Group Meeting 1

Section III (Community Organization and Social Action), Group Meeting 1

LEGISLATIVE ACTION AT THE STATE AND LOCAL LEVEL (Workshop Session 2)

Presiding: Fred Brown, Executive Director, Protestant Community Services, Detroit

Resource leader: Norman V. Lourie, Executive Deputy Secretary, Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, Harrisburg

Speaker: Roy Borom, Assistant Professor, School of Social Work, University of Maryland, Baltimore; delegate to Maryland Constitutional Convention

Cosponsors:

National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, Group Meeting 2

National Association for Statewide Health and Welfare, Group Meeting 2

NASW, Group Meeting 2

Section III (Community Organization and Social Action), Group Meeting 2

SOCIAL AGENCY: LAUNCHING PAD FOR SOCIAL CHANGE (Workshop Session 3)

Presiding: Roger M. Lind, Professor, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Speaker: Bernard C. Fisher, Director, Department of Public Affairs, Community Service Society, New York

Cosponsors:

National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, Group Meeting 3

National Association for Statewide Health and Welfare, Group Meeting 3

NASW, Group Meeting 3

Section III (Community Organization and Social Action), Group Meeting 3

DIRECT ACTION FOR SOCIAL CHANGE (Workshop Session 4)

Presiding: Charles Grosser, Associate Professor of Social Work, New York University School of Social Work, New York

Speakers: Harry Specht, Lecturer, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley

Anthony J. Maggiore, Administrator, Inner City Development Project, Milwaukee

Cosponsors:

National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, Group Meeting 4

National Association for Statewide Health and Welfare, Group Meeting 4

NASW, Group Meeting 4

Section III (Community Organization and Social Action), Group Meeting 4

FORMING COALITIONS FOR SOCIAL ACTION

AND SOCIAL CHANGE (Workshop Session 5)

Presiding: Gordon Manser, Associate Executive Director, National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, New York

Speaker: Lowell Iberg, President, National Association for Statewide Health and Welfare; Deputy Executive Director, State Communities Aid Association, New York

Cosponsors:

National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, Group Meeting 5

National Association for Statewide Health and Welfare, Group Meeting 5
NASW, Group Meeting 5
Section III (Community Organization and Social Action), Group Meeting 5

LITIGATION AS A METHOD OF SOCIAL ACTION

(Workshop Session 6)

Presiding: Earl Johnson, Director, Legal Services Program, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.

Speakers: Dan Morris, Associate Executive Director, Mobilization for Youth, New York

Hal Rothwax, Director of Legal Services, Mobilization for Youth, New York

Cosponsors:

National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, Group Meeting 6
National Association for Statewide Health and Welfare, Group Meeting 6
NASW, Group Meeting 6
Section III (Community Organization and Social Action), Group Meeting 6

SOCIAL ACTION IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD SETTING

(Workshop Session 7)

Presiding: George Brager, Associate Professor, Columbia University School of Social Work, New York

Speakers: Stanley Z. Mazer, Associate Director, Community Action Program of Baltimore

Edwin P. Stephenson, Berkeley, Calif.

Cosponsors:

National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, Group Meeting 7
National Association for Statewide Health and Welfare, Group Meeting 7
NASW, Group Meeting 7
Section III (Community Organization and Social Action), Group Meeting 7

SOCIAL ACTION IN RURAL SETTINGS (Workshop Session 8)

Presiding: Virginia Turner, Associate Professor of Child Welfare, Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.

Speaker: James Dinsmore, Executive Director, Santa Clara County Community Council, Calif.

Cosponsors:

National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, Group Meeting 8
National Association for Statewide Health and Welfare, Group Meeting 8
NASW, Group Meeting 8
Section III (Community Organization and Social Action), Group Meeting 8

HOW TO ORGANIZE A SOCIAL ACTION WORKSHOP

(Workshop Session 9)

Workshop leader: Lawrence Grossman, Assistant Professor, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley

Cosponsors:

National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, Group Meeting 9

National Association for Statewide Health and Welfare, Group Meeting 9
 NASW, Group Meeting 9
 Section III (Community Organization and Social Action), Group Meeting 9

4:00 P.M.—5:30 P.M.

GROUP CARE OF CHILDREN: PROGRAMS AND OUTCOMES IN SOME FOREIGN SETTINGS

Presiding: Wells C. Klein, General Director, International Social Service, American Branch, New York

Speaker: Martin Wolins, Professor of Social Welfare, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley

Discussant: David Fanshel, Professor, Columbia University School of Social Work, New York

Sponsor: Child Welfare League of America, Group Meeting 1

KEY ISSUES IN FOSTER FAMILY CARE IN 1968

Presiding: Mrs. Alexander McAndrew, Board member, Child Welfare League of America; President, Sunny Hills, San Anselmo, Calif.

Speaker: Lloyd S. Richardson, Executive Director, Children's Aid Society of Metropolitan Toronto

Sponsor: Child Welfare League of America, Group Meeting 2

BRIEF TREATMENT AND CRISIS INTERVENTION

Presiding: Mrs. Robert S. Borovoy, Past President, Greater Bay Area Council of Family Service Agencies, San Francisco

Planned Short-Term Treatment

Speaker: John P. Turner, Executive Director, Family Service Association of Orange County, Tustin, Calif.

Twenty-four-Hour Crisis Intervention

Speaker: Leonard McConnell, Executive Director, Family Service Association of Santa Clara County, San Jose, Calif.

Sponsor: Family Service Association of America, Group Meeting 1

THE TRIPLE CRISIS: ADOLESCENCE, EARLY MARRIAGE, AND PARENTHOOD

Presiding: Col. Jane E. Wrieden, National Consultant, Women's and Children's Services, National Headquarters, Salvation Army, New York
 Adolescence, Early Marriage, and Pregnancy

Speaker: Mrs. Maurine LaBarre, Research Social Work Consultant, Education Improvement Program, Durham, N.C.

Adolescence, Early Marriage, and Fatherhood

Speaker: Weston LaBarre, Professor, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Duke University, Durham, N.C.

Cosponsors:

Child Welfare League of America, Group Meeting 3

Family Service Association of America, Group Meeting 2

Florence Crittenton Association of America

National Council on Illegitimacy
National Urban League
Planned Parenthood-World Population
The Salvation Army
The Volunteers of America

8:30 P.M.

THE IMPACT OF THE CLIMATE OF WAR ON
SOCIAL WELFARE POLICY AND PRACTICE

(NASW Commission on Peace and Disarmament)

Presiding: Mrs. Eva Lapin, pediatrics psychiatric social worker, Kaiser Hospital, San Francisco; Chairman, Peace and Disarmament Commission, Golden Gate Chapter, NASW

Speakers: Nathan E. Cohen, Professor of Social Welfare and Dean-elect, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Los Angeles

The Hon. Phillip E. Burton, Congressman, State of California, Washington, D.C.

Sponsor: NASW

FRIDAY, MAY 31

9:00 A.M.—10:45 A.M.

FEDERAL AGENCIES, NATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS,
AND THE POLITICS OF WELFARE

Presiding: Bernard Ross, Associate Director, Graduate Department of Social Work, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

Speaker: Charles I. Schottland, Dean, Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.

Discussant: Alan D. Wade, Dean, School of Social Work, Sacramento State College, Sacramento, Calif.

Sponsor: Division (cosponsored by National Assembly and NCSW)

CONSTELLATION OF SERVICES DESIGNED TO
MEET THE NEEDS OF THE AGING POPULATION

Presiding: Mrs. A. M. G. Russell, Chairman, California Committee on Aging, Atherton, Calif.

Speakers: David DeMarche, Executive Director, Service Program for Older San Franciscans, San Francisco

Ronald H. Born, General Manager, San Francisco Department of Social Services

Sidney Friedman, Executive Director, Jewish Home for the Aged, San Francisco

Leonore Rivesman, Director of a demonstration project for Family Service Association of America

Sponsor: Section I (Casework), Group Meeting 1

RELATIONSHIPS AT THE COMMUNITY LEVEL

Chairman and discussant: Louis L. Bennett, Deputy Regional Commissioner, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, New York; Cochairman, National Conference of Lawyers and Social Workers

Cochairman and discussant: Howard G. Brown, Cochairman, National Conference of Lawyers and Social Workers; formerly Juvenile Court Judge, Milwaukee

Speakers: Barbara Curran, senior research attorney, American Bar Foundation, Chicago

Mrs. Audrey Smith, research social worker, American Bar Foundation, Chicago

Cosponsors:

National Conference of Lawyers and Social Workers

Section I (Casework), Group Meeting 2

"COME UP" VS. "DROP OUT"

Presiding: Jacob C. Guthartz, Social Planning Director, Jewish Welfare Federation, San Francisco

Speaker: Orville B. Luster, Executive Director, Youth for Service, San Francisco

Sponsor: Section II (Group Work), Group Meeting 1

PRINCIPLES FOR MAINTAINING INDIVIDUAL
AND GROUP INTEGRITY DURING THE
TREATMENT PROCESS

Presiding: Lida Schneider, Psychiatric Social Work Consultant, Community Mental Health Training Program, Langley-Porter Neuropsychiatric Institute, San Francisco

Speaker: Baruch Levine, Assistant Professor, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago

Sponsor: Section II (Group Work), Group Meeting 1

THE NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER: A NEW
DEFINITION OF FUNCTION

Presiding: Lester L. Scheaffer, Executive Director, Golden Gate Neighborhood Centers Association, San Francisco

Speakers: Gary Rosenberg, Assistant Professor, Graduate School of Social Work, Adelphi University, Garden City, N.Y.

Phillip Coltoff, Director of Program, Children's Aid Society, New York

Sponsor: Section II (Group Work), Group Meeting 3

APPLICATION OF STAGES OF GROUP DEVELOPMENT
TO TREATMENT GROUPS

Presiding: Hyman J. Weiner, Associate Professor of Social Work, Columbia University, New York

Speakers: Louise Frey, Associate Professor, School of Social Work, Boston University

James A. Garland, Director of Activity Therapies, McLean Hospital, Belmont, Mass.

Sponsor: Section II (Group Work), Group Meeting 4

THREE MODELS OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION PRACTICE

Presiding: Charles Grosser, Associate Professor of Social Work, School of Social Work, New York University, New York

Speaker: Jack Rothman, Associate Professor, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Sponsor: Section III (Community Organization and Social Action), Group Meeting 1

EVALUATION OF ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAMS

Presiding: William Lawrence, Director, Planning and Research, Human Resources Administration, New York

The Impact of Poverty Funds on Voluntary Agencies

Speakers: Camille Lambert, Research Director, Health and Welfare Association of Allegheny County, Pittsburgh

Arthur White, Vice President, Daniel Yankelovich, Inc., New York

Cosponsors:

Section III (Community Organization and Social Action), Group Meeting 2

Section IV (Social Research), Group Meeting 1

RESEARCH ON REFERRALS: PRESENT KNOWLEDGE AND FURTHER QUESTIONS

Presiding: Mignon Sauber, Director, Research Department, Community Council of Greater New York, New York

Coauthor and speaker: Eileen Lester, Medical Social Consultant, Division of Medical Care Administration, Public Health Service, Arlington, Va.

Speaker: Leonard Bloksberg, Associate Professor, School of Social Work, Boston University

Discussants: Jack E. Sigler, Institute for Community Studies, Kansas City, Mo.

Eileen M. Corrigan, Senior Research Associate, Community Council of Greater New York, New York

Sponsor: Section IV (Social Research), Group Meeting 2

NATIONWIDE SURVEY OF LEGALLY REPORTED PHYSICAL ABUSE OF CHILDREN: FIRST-YEAR FINDINGS

Presiding: Scott Briar, Associate Professor, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley

Speaker: David G. Gil, Associate Professor, Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.

Discussants: William Ireland, Chief, Division of Planning, Research and Statistics, Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, Springfield

Vincent De Francis, Director, Children's Division, American Humane Association, Denver

Cosponsors:

Section I (Casework), Group Meeting 3

Section IV (Social Research), Group Meeting 3

AUTHORS' PANEL

Presiding: John M. Riley, Assistant Professor, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

The Disposition of Suspected Fraud Cases in the AFDC Program

Speaker: Paul Weinberger, Associate Professor, Department of Social Work, San Francisco State College

Administrative Due Process: the Next Step Forward in Service Delivery

Speaker: Louis Levitt, Executive Director, Social Work Recruiting Center of Greater New York, New York

Innovation and Organization in Public Assistance: the Case for Eligibility Self-Declaration

Speaker: Sydney E. Bernard, Associate Professor, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Sponsor: Section V (Administration)

THE STATUS OF THE SOCIAL WELFARE EFFORT IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Presiding: Mary K. Keeley, Associate Professor, Smith College School of Social Work, Northampton, Mass.

Speakers: James R. Dumpson, Dean, School of Social Service, Fordham University, New York

Martha Branscombe, Deputy Chief, Refugee and Social Welfare Division, Bureau for Vietnam, Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C.

Sponsor: U.S. Committee of ICSW

11:15 A.M.—12:45 P.M.

GENERAL SESSION

Planning, Politics, and Social Change

Presiding: Wayne Vasey, Professor, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; former Dean, George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis; President, NCSW

Speaker: Whitney M. Young, Jr., Executive Director, National Urban League, New York; Past President, NCSW

Report of the Nominating Committee

David DeMarche, Executive Director, Service Program for Older San Franciscans

Introduction of NCSW President for 1968-69

Sponsor: Division (cosponsored by National Assembly and NCSW)

Appendix B: Business Organization of the Conference for 1968

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SOCIAL WELFARE is a voluntary association of individual and organizational members who have joined the Conference to promote and share in discussion of the problems and methods identified with the field of social work and immediately related fields.

NCSW OFFICERS

President: Wayne Vasey, Ann Arbor, Mich.

First Vice President: Joseph H. Reid, New York

Second Vice President: Mrs. Jackson Chance, San Francisco

Third Vice President: Richard J. Clendenen, Minneapolis

Secretary: Donald E. Brieland, Chicago

Treasurer: William S. Guthrie, Columbus, Ohio

Past President: Whitney M. Young, Jr., New York

President-elect: Arthur S. Flemming, Eugene, Oreg.

Executive Secretary: Joe R. Hoffer, Columbus, Ohio

NCSW NATIONAL BOARD

(includes Officers listed above)

Term expires 1968: (Miss) Frankie V. Adams, Atlanta, Ga.; Philip Bernstein, New York; Eileen Blackey, Los Angeles; Eugene H. Freedheim, Cleveland; Harold A. Hagen, Washington, D.C.; Franklin W. Wallin, Jenison, Mich.; Helen E. Woods, Baltimore

Term expires 1969: Florence M. Aitchison, Kansas City, Mo.; Mrs. Mildred C. Barry, Cleveland; Sam S. Grais, St. Paul, Minn.; Gordon Manser, New York; Ruth M. Pauley, Boston; Albert E. Rhudy, San Francisco, the Hon. Robert C. Weaver, Washington, D.C.

Term expires 1970: Leona Baumgartner, M.D., Boston; Bertram M. Beck, New York; Lisle C. Carter, Jr., Washington, D.C.; David R. Hunter, New York; Morris Hursh, St. Paul, Minn.; Rabbi David Jacobson, San Antonio, Texas; Judge Florence M. Kelley, New York

Representative from NCSW Committee on Public Relations and Development: C. F. McNeil, New York

Representative from U.S. Committee of ICSW: Kenneth W. Kindelsperger, Louisville, Ky.

Representative from National Association for Statewide Health and Welfare: Wilson H. Posey, Columbus, Ohio

Chairman, Advisory Committee on Program Scope, Content, and Participation: Robert H. MacRae, Chicago

NCSW COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS

Chairman: Mrs. George Abbott, Washington, D.C.

Vice Chairman: David F. DeMarche, San Francisco

Term expires 1968: Mrs. George Abbott, Washington, D.C.; Ruth Chaskel, New York; David F. DeMarche, San Francisco; Geraldine Gourley, Chapel Hill, N.C.; Paul P. Kalin, Homewood, Ill.; H. Curtis Mial, Washington, D.C.; William F. Moynihan, Nashville, Tenn.

Term expires 1969: Junius Allison, Chicago; Joseph Hall, Cincinnati; Mrs. Cernoria Johnson, Washington, D.C.; Harriett King, Omaha, Nebr.; Paul Mendenhall, New York; Campbell Murphy, Boston; Mrs. Victor Shaw, Fairmont, W.Va.

Term expires 1970: Dean A. Clark, M.D., Pittsburgh; Fern M. Colborn, New York; James R. Dumpson, New York; Katherine Hudson, Oklahoma City; Mrs. Annie Lee Sandusky, Washington, D.C.; Wilbur J. Schmidt, Madison, Wis.; Harry T. Sealy, Cleveland

NCSW COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC RELATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: C. F. McNeil, New York

Vice Chairman: Mrs. Alice Adler, New York

Term expires 1968: Mrs. Leonard Bernheim, New York; Mrs. Virginia R. Doscher, Chicago; Moe Hoffman, Washington, D.C.; Irving Rimer, New York; Henry Weber, New York

Term expires 1969: Helen Christopherson, New York; Herbert S. Fowler, Washington, D.C.; Lt. Commissioner John Grace, New York; William T. Kirk, Los Angeles; Mary Helen Merrill, Washington, D.C.; Anne L. New, New York; Guichard Parris, New York; Bernard Postal, New York; the Very Rev. Msgr. Thomas J. Reese, Wilmington, Del.

Term expires 1970: George H. Holsten, Jr., New Brunswick, N.J.; Mrs. Frances A. Koestler, Brooklyn, N.Y.; John H. McMahon, New York; Paul Mendenhall, New York; Philip E. Ryan, Washington, D.C.

Consultant: Harold N. Weiner, New York

Ex officio: William S. Guthrie, Columbus, Ohio

NCSW TELLERS COMMITTEE

Chairman: Merriss Cornell, Columbus, Ohio

NCSW EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

Chairman: Mary Houk, New York

Members: Martha Branscombe, Arlington, Va.; Arthur Katz, New York; Seaton W. Manning, San Francisco; Jay Roney, Chicago; William Schwartz, New York; Jack Stumpf, San Diego, Calif.

U.S. COMMITTEE OF ICSW

Chairman: Kenneth W. Kindelsperger, Louisville, Ky.

Vice Chairman: C. Virgil Martin, Chicago

Secretary: Ellen Winston, Raleigh, N.C.

Treasurer: James R. Dumpson, New York

Executive Secretary: Sara Lee Berkman, New York

Representatives of National Organizations: American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, Eugene Shenefield, New York; American Public Welfare Association, Raleigh C. Hobson, Baltimore; Council on Social Work Education, Katherine A. Kendall, New York; National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, Mrs. Michael Harris, New York; National Association of Social Workers, Kurt Reichert, New York; Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dorothy Lally, Washington, D.C.

Members-at-Large:

Term expires 1968: Mrs. Alice Adler, New York; Mrs. Julius Alexander, Miami; Andrew W. L. Brown, Detroit; Sam S. Grais, St. Paul, Minn.; Col. Jane E. Wrieden, New York

Term expires 1969: Mrs. Margaret Berry, New York; Martha Branscombe, Arlington, Va.; Leonard J. Duhl, M.D., Washington, D.C.; Margaret Hickey, St. Louis; Sol Morton Isaac, Columbus, Ohio

Term expires 1970: Henry S. Ollendorff, Cleveland; Sanford Solender, New York; Mrs. Jayne B. Spain, Cincinnati; Mary Switzer, Washington, D.C.; Anne Wilkens, Austin, Texas

Liaison: NASW-European Unit, Ruby B. Pernell, Cleveland; New England Committee, Gaspar Jako, Boston; NCSW Program Committee, Mary K. Keeley, Northampton, Mass.; NCSW, Richard J. Clendenen, Minneapolis

Subcommittee Chairmen: Nominating Committee, Nelson Jackson, New York; Program Participants, Mrs. Susan T. Pettiss, Cambridge, Mass.; U.S. Report, Wayne Vasey, Ann Arbor, Mich.; U.S. Exhibit, Anne L. New, New York

Permanent Committee Members of ICSW: Ellen Winston, Raleigh, N.C.; Jane Hoey, New York

Officer of ICSW: Charles I. Schottland, Waltham, Mass.

NCSW COMMITTEE ON PROGRAM

Chairman: Wayne Vasey, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Members-at-Large. Term expires 1968: Loula Dunn, Washington, D.C.; Robert H. MacRae, Chicago. *Term expires 1969:* Robert E. Bondy, New York; Andrew W. L. Brown, Detroit. *Term expires 1970:* Dean A. Clark, M.D., Pittsburgh; Thomas Moan, Piscataway, N.J.

Representatives of National Social Welfare Organizations: American Public Welfare Association, Joseph H. Louchheim, New York; National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, John F. Larberg, New York; National Association of Social Workers, Mrs. Mildred Kilinski, New York; Council on Social Work Education, Patricia Stickney, New York; National Association for Statewide Health and Welfare, Lowell Iberg, New York; National Health Council, Peter G. Meek, New York

Liaison from NCSW Audio-Visual Committee: Ann Tanneyhill, New York

Liaison from NCSW Committee on Combined Associate Groups: Mrs. Naomi T. Gray, New York

Liaison from NCSW Public Relations Committee: Mrs. Frances A. Koestler, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Liaison from U.S. Committee, ICSW: Mary K. Keeley, Northampton, Mass.

Liaison from Canadian Welfare Council: Maurice Miron, Ottawa, Canada
President-elect: Arthur S. Flemming, Eugene, Oreg.
Past President: Whitney M. Young, Jr., New York
Chairmen of Sections and Division, ex officio

NCSW SECTION COMMITTEES

SECTION I. CASEWORK

Chairman: Selby Fly, Dallas

Vice Chairman: Virginia L. Tannar, Washington, D.C.

Term expires 1968: Mrs. Miriam C. Andrus, East Orange, N.J.; Mrs. Randolph Guggenheimer, New York; Thomas D. Hunt, Chicago; Eileen E. Lester, Washington, D.C.; the Hon. Justine Polier, Lake Placid, N.Y.; Mrs. Bernece K. Simon, Chicago; Leontine R. Young, Newark, N.J.

Term expires 1969: Ronald V. Dellums, Oakland, Calif.; Melvin Mogulof, San Francisco; Richard Rogers, San Francisco; Harry Specht, San Francisco

Term expires 1970: Arthur Berliner, Fort Worth, Texas; Louise d'A. Fairchild, Dallas; Peter Gaupp, Dallas; Harry Tanner, Dallas

SECTION II. GROUP WORK

Chairman: Willard C. Rasmussen, Chicago

Vice Chairman: Ira L. Gibbons, Washington, D.C.

Term expires 1968: Paul Akana, Oakland, Calif.; George Brager, New York; Milton A. Brown, New Haven, Conn.; Jack Dauber, Los Angeles; James Kane, Chino, Calif.; Sara E. Maloney, Los Angeles; Jean Reynolds, Washington, D.C.

Term expires 1969: Ed Lee, Newark, N.J.; Mrs. Alma Quigley, Trenton, N.J.; Louise Shoemaker, Philadelphia; Dr. Hyman Weiner, New York

Term expires 1970: Mr. Gene Aronowitz, Chicago; Mrs. Phyllis L. Bare, Chicago; Morris Levin, Chicago; Clyde E. Murray, Chicago

SECTION III. COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION AND SOCIAL ACTION

Chairman: Sanford Kravitz, Waltham, Mass.

Vice Chairman: Percy H. Steele, Jr., San Francisco

Term expires 1968: Mark Battle, Washington, D.C.; Preston David, New York; Robert F. Fenley, Phoenix, Ariz.; David R. Hunter, New York; Walter Johnson, Indianapolis; Jeweldean Jones, New York; Edgar May, Washington, D.C.; Frank W. Newgent, Madison, Wis.; George Rohrlich, Philadelphia; Max Silverstein, Philadelphia; Mrs. Eloise Waite, Washington, D.C.

Term expires 1970: Harold Demone, Boston; Mel King, Boston; Mrs. Ferne K. Kolodner, Baltimore; Edward Newman, Boston

SECTION IV. SOCIAL RESEARCH

Chairman: Sidney E. Zimbalist, Chicago

Vice Chairman: Ann W. Shyne, New York

Term expires 1968: Walter Beattie, Jr., Syracuse, N.Y.; Maurice B. Hamovitch, Los Angeles; Marjorie Main, Cleveland; Ellen Perkins, Washington, D.C.; Mrs. Ralph Pumphrey, St. Louis

Term expires 1969: David Fanshell, New York; Mignon Sauber, New York; Alvin Schorr, Washington, D.C.

Term expires 1970: Scott Briar, Berkeley, Calif.; Saul Kaplan, Chicago; Irving Spergel, Chicago; Jack Weiner, Bethesda, Md.

SECTION V. ADMINISTRATION

Chairman: Roger M. Lind, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Vice Chairman: Joseph McDonald, Cincinnati

Term expires 1968: Ronald H. Born, San Francisco; Frank Bruel, Chicago; Andrew F. Juras, Salem, Oreg.

Term expires 1969: Alexander J. Allen, New York; Edmund G. Burbank, New York; Carl B. Flaxman, Dallas; Leonard W. Lavis, Glenwood, Iowa; Wilbur Parker, Sacramento, Calif.; E. Kirby Warren, New York; Corinne Wolfe, Washington, D.C.

Term expires 1970: S. J. Axelrod, M.D., Ann Arbor, Mich.; Joseph L. Farrel, Lansing, Mich.; Emeric Kurtagh, Detroit; William T. Patrick, Detroit

NCSW DIVISION COMMITTEE

Chairman: Roland L. Warren, Waltham, Mass.

Ex officio: Wayne Vasey, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Members: Edwin C. Berry, Chicago; Robert Binstock, Waltham, Mass.; James R. Dumpson, New York; Mitchell I. Ginsberg, New York; Charles Hawkins, Washington, D.C.; Wyatt C. Jones, Waltham, Mass.; Guy Justis, Chicago; Melville H. Hosch, Chicago (deceased); C. F. McNeil, New York; Frances Piven, New York; Martin Rein, Bryn Mawr, Pa.; William Robinson, Chicago; Bernard Ross, Bryn Mawr, Pa.; Alvin Schorr, Washington, D.C.; Thomas D. Sherrard, Hammond, Ind.; Herman Somers, Princeton, N.J.; Charles Willie, Syracuse, N.Y.

NCSW AUDIO-VISUAL COMMITTEE

Chairman: Ann Tanneyhill, New York

Vice Chairman: Mrs. Ann Booth, New York

Consultants: Summer Glimcher, New York; Rohama Lee, New York; Robert Mitchell, New York

Members. Term expires 1968: Samuel H. Elfert, New York; Harry Olesker, New York

Term expires 1969: Reva Fine Holtzman, New York; Marie Stewart, New York; Dorothy Sutherland, Washington, D.C.; Frederick Todd, New York (Mrs. Carol Hale, New York, alternate); William Tracy, New York

Term expires 1970: Robert Finehout, New York; Ted O. Thackrey, New York

COMMITTEE ON MEETINGS OF COMBINED
ASSOCIATE GROUPS

Chairman: Mrs. Naomi T. Gray, Planned Parenthood-World Population

Vice Chairman: Mrs. Betty H. Andersen, National Council for Homemaker Services

Members: American Legion, National Child Welfare Division, Fred T. Kuszmaul; American National Red Cross, Mary Helen Merrill; National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, Mrs. Dorothy Gazzolo (alternate, Mrs. Patricia O'Rourke); National Association of Social Workers, Mrs. Mildred Kilinski; National Council of Churches, Committee on Social

Welfare, Rev. Carl E. Thomas; National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, Mrs. Elisabeth Day; Travelers Aid Association of America, Mrs. M. Constance McDermott; United Community Funds and Councils of America, Kenneth I. Williams; Veterans Administration Social Work Service, Sidney Hirsch

PLANNING COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN APPLICATIONS SESSIONS, CAGs

National Level: John Larberg, *Chairman*, National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, New York; Mary Helen Merrill, *Cochairman*, American National Red Cross, Washington, D.C.

Regional Level: Mrs. Adele Trobe, *Chairman*, Planned Parenthood-World Population, New York

State Level: Lowell Iberg, *Chairman*, State Communities Aid Association, New York

City Level: Sidney Hirsch, *Chairman*, Veterans Administration Hospital, New York; Rev. Carl E. Thomas, *Cochairman*, Board of Social Ministry, Lutheran Church in America, New York

Neighborhood Level: Mrs. Elisabeth Day, *Chairman*, National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, New York

Rural Level: Truman Solverud, *Chairman*, American National Red Cross, Alexandria, Va.

PROGRAM CHAIRMEN OF ASSOCIATE GROUPS

AFL-CIO Community Service Activities—Ray Andrus

American Association of Homes for the Aging—Lester Davis

American Council for Nationalities Service—Robert W. Goldfarb

American Friends Service Committee—Frank Hunt

American Home Economics Association—Mrs. Margaret V. Finley (Eleanore T. Lurry, alternate)

American Humane Association, Children's Division—Vincent De Francis

American Immigration and Citizenship Conference—Mrs. Sonia Blumenthal

American Jewish Committee—Mrs. Ann G. Wolfe

American Legion, National Child Welfare Division—Fred T. Kuszmaul

American National Red Cross—Mary Helen Merrill

American Public Welfare Association—Shad J. Hoffman

American Social Health Association—Earle G. Lippincott

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith—Oscar Cohen

Army Community Service, Headquarters Department of the Army—Lt. Col. William G. Hill

Association for Voluntary Sterilization—Mrs. Roxanne Olivo

Association of the Junior Leagues of America—Dorothy E. Swinburne

Big Brothers of America—Thomas E. O'Brien

Child Study Association of America—Mrs. Ada M. Daniels

Child Welfare League of America—Elizabeth Christie

Community Development Foundation—M. Millard Miller

Conference of Chief Social Workers in State and Territorial Mental Health Programs—William H. Wilsnack

Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds—Maurice Bernstein
Council on Social Work Education—Patricia J. Stickney
Executive Council, Episcopal Church, Department of Christian Social Relations—Mrs. Charles S. Monroe
Family Service Association of America—Patrick V. Riley
Florence Crittenton Association of America—Katherine Daly
Goodwill Industries of America—Robert E. Watkins
International Social Service, American Branch—Sydney Talisman
Methodist Health and Welfare—Rev. H. Leonard Boche
National Assembly for Social Policy and Development—John F. Larberg
National Association for Mental Health—D. Douglas Waterstreet
National Association for Statewide Health and Welfare—Lowell Iberg
National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials—Mrs. Dorothy Gazzolo
National Association of Social Workers—Mrs. Mildred Kilinski
National Committee for the Day Care of Children—Lawrence Feldman
National Committee on Employment of Youth—Eli E. Cohen
National Conference of Jewish Communal Service—Preston David
National Council for Homemaker Services—Mrs. Betty H. Andersen
National Council of Churches Committee on Social Welfare—John McDowell
National Council of Jewish Women—Mrs. Zmira Goodman
National Council of Young Men's Christian Associations—John W. Copeland
National Council on Alcoholism—Herman E. Krimmel
National Council on Crime and Delinquency—Robert Trimble
National Council on Illegitimacy—Ruth Chaskel
National Council on the Aging—Gertrude Hall
National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers—Mrs. Elisabeth Day
National Health Council—Peter G. Meek
National Jewish Welfare Board—Harry A. Schatz
National Legal Aid and Defender Association—Mayo H. Stiegler
National Presbyterian Health and Welfare Association—Robert Barrie
National Public Relations Council of Health and Welfare Services—Harold N. Weiner
National Society for Crippled Children and Adults—Mrs. Rhoda Gellman
National Urban League—Mrs. Betti S. Whaley
Planned Parenthood—World Population—Mrs. Naomi T. Gray
The Salvation Army—Col. Jane E. Wrieden
Social Work Vocational Bureau—Clara M. Allen
Travelers Aid Association of America—Mrs. M. Constance McDermott
United Cerebral Palsy Associations—Ernest Weinrich
United Community Funds and Councils of America—Kenneth I. Williams
United HIAS Service—Frederick Fried
United Seamen's Service—Mrs. Lillian Rabins
Veterans Administration Central Office (122)—Claire R. Lustman
The Volunteers of America—Lt. Col. Belle Leach
YWCA of the U.S.A.—Mrs. Wenonah Bond Logan

Index

ABA, *see* American Bar Association

Abstracts for Social Workers, 113

Addams, Jane, 134-35

Advocacy, 61, 63-72; in community organization, 95; definition and role of, 67-68; nondirected, 72; objectives of, 68-69; reason for, 64-67; as technical assistance, 68-69

"Advocacy and Urban Planning," 58-77

AFDC, *see* Aid to Families with Dependent Children

Aged, social policy on the, 31

Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), 165

American Assembly, conference sponsored by, 26

American Bar Association (ABA), conference sponsored by, 26

American Institute of Planners, 60

American Psychological Association (APA), 110, 120

American Public Welfare Association (APWA), 108; periodicals and publications of, 109

Antipoverty program, 54; neighborhood legal services of, 19; new concept of community organization in, 95; Project Enable, 13

Anti-union laws, elimination of, as social priority, 54

APA, *see* American Psychological Association

APWA, *see* American Public Welfare Association

Arden House conference, 8, 22-24, 29

Ares, Charles E., quoted, 97

Aristotle, cited, 17

Asian Regional Seminar on Social Welfare Manpower (Tokyo, 1967), 133

Associated National Organizations, 114

Association of Black Social Workers, *see* National Association of Black Social Workers

Austria-Hungary, tests for new legislation in, 92

Automation, welfare system and, 39-40

Barker, Robinson, cited, 38

Bedford-Stuyvesant (New York), 65, 72

Bell, Daniel, quoted, 3

Ben W. Heineman Commission, 24, 29

Benton, Brooke, 155

Bigotry, elimination of, 141-55

Black power, 13-14, 145-46

Boston-Roxbury area, unemployment in, 81

Burns, Eveline M., 23; cited, 9

"Business and Welfare: Coalition for Social Advancement," 33-44

Business community: involvement in social policy formulation, 22-26, 29; and social welfare, 33-44

California, fruit workers, 156, 158, 159, 161

Chicago, poverty in, 79ⁿ.

Churches, involvement of, in social welfare in Detroit, 40-41

Citizens' Crusade against Poverty, 6

Citizens' Inquiry into Hunger, 5

City government, 58-59; at-large municipal elections, 59

City hall, urban planning and, 58-59, 62

Civil disorder, cause of, 145

Civil rights, 10, 148

Clarence Gideon case, 19

Clark, Ramsey, 158, 159, 161-62; paper by, 16-20

Cleveland: fatherless families in Negro slums of, 80ⁿ.; poverty in, 79ⁿ.

Coalition for Action Now, 159

Commager, Henry Steele, quoted, 135

Committee for Economic Development (New York City), 24, 29

Communication: audiences in, 106; content of, 114-19; expression in, 105-6;

- Communication (*Continued*)
 horizontal, 113-14; improvements in, 105-6; information in, 105; public relations as, 118; in social welfare, 105-25; vertical, 108-13
- "Community group work," 132
- Community organization: advocacy in, 95; change in concepts of, 94-95; and housing, 102-3; law and social work in, 94-104
- Community organizers, teamed with lawyers, 103
- Congress, U.S.: criticism of, 148, 165, 167; economy measures, 11, 54; H.R. 12280, 53; unfinished business, 53
- Consensus, in social welfare programs, 49-50
- "Constructive workers," in India, 137-38
- Corrections, as area of social work, 17-18
- Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), 108; periodicals and publications of, 109
- Courts, and the poor, 98
- Crime in the streets, 55, 148-49
- Criminal Justice Act (1964), 19
- CSWE, *see* Council on Social Work Education
- Dasgupta, S., quoted, 137-38
- Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW), 27, 73, 108; periodicals and publications of, 109
- Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), 62
- Department of Labor, 82
- Detroit: job training, 39; Michigan Bell Telephone Co., 39; New Detroit Committee, 34, 35, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43-44; racial riot, 34; religious community's involvement in social welfare, 40-41; United Foundation, 37; Urban Coalition, 34; welfare and business cooperation, 34-44
- Developing countries: social work in, 131-34; social work education in, 133-34, 139
- "Domestic Marshall Plan," 144
- Doverman, Max, cited, 96
- Education, federal aid to, as social priority, 54
- Employment: full, 12; of the hard-core unemployed, 53; policies of, for Negroes in urban slums, 86-88; priorities in work policies, 86; work policies for Negro slum-dwellers, 82-86
- Europe, income policy in, 89
- Families: fatherless, in Negro slums, 80-81; urban nonwhite poor, 80-81; allowances for, 90-91
- Flemming, Arthur S., paper by, 164-68
- France, Anatole, cited, 18; quoted, 16
- Frost, Robert, cited, 58
- Fruit workers (Calif.), strike by, 156, 158, 159, 161
- Galbraith, John Kenneth, quoted, 92
- Gandhian movement, 137
- Gardner, John, 166; quoted, 142
- Ghetto, 7, 12; Detroit riot in, 34; priority of, in welfare programs, 64-65; *see also* Urban slums
- Ginsberg, Mitchell, cited, 10
- Graham, Fred P., quoted, 26
- "Great Society jobs," 86-87, 91
- Grosser, Charles F., quoted, 95, 96
- Guardians, Corps of (proposed), 86-87
- Harlem Prep school, 146
- Hazard, Leland, 23
- Health Aides, Corps of (proposed), 87
- Health insurance, voluntary, 54
- Health program, as social priority, 54
- Heineman Commission, *see* Ben W. Heineman Commission
- HEW, *see* Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
- Hoffer, Joe R., 158; paper by, 105-25; quoted, 106
- Home Aides, Corps of (proposed), 87
- Hough (Cleveland): fatherless families in Negro slums, 80*n.*; poverty, 79*n.*; unemployment, 81
- Housing, and community organization, 102-3
- Housing program, as social priority, 53
- HUD, *see* Department of Housing and Urban Development
- Hudson, Joseph L., Jr., 34, 37, 40
- Hull House (Chicago), 135
- Humphrey, Hubert H., Greetings to the Conference, xv
- Hunter's Point (San Francisco), 65, 69-71

- ICSW, *see* International Conference on Social Welfare
- Income maintenance, 12, 29, 30; Ben W. Heineman Commission, 24; as social priority, 56; support for, 29
- Income-support programs, for middle and upper classes, 30, 150
- Incomes policy: in Europe, 89; family allowance, 90-91; for Negroes in urban slums, 88-93; social assistance program for, 90-91
- India: "constructive workers" in, 137-38; as recipient of financial aid, 131
- Industry, participation of, in Arden House conference, 22-24
- Interdependence, 14-15
- International aid, 129-31
- International Conference on Social Welfare (ICSW), 119, 133
- Job training, 39, 84-85
- Johnson, Lyndon B., 167; Greetings to the Conference, xiii
- Jones, Hugh R., paper by, 21-32
- Juvenile delinquency, new concept of community organization in projects, 94-95
- Kaplan, Marshall, paper by, 58-77
- Keith-Lucas, Alan, quoted, 97
- Kerner Commission, *see* National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders
- Keyword in Context (KWIC) Index*, 120
- Killam, William, quoted, 57
- King, Martin Luther, Jr., 136-37; salute for, 155
- King, Mrs. Martin Luther, Jr., cited, 14
- Knowledge: explosion of, 17; as social work element, 115-16
- Ku Klux Klan, 144
- KWIC (Keyword in Context) Index*, 120
- Labor: fruit workers strike, 156, 158, 159, 161; participation of, in Arden House conference, 22-24; social priorities and, 45-57
- "Labor's View on Social Priorities," 45-57
- Law: enforcement of, as social priority, 55; legal services for welfare recipients, 26; and the poor, 96-97, 98; rights and the, 18-19; and social work, in community organization, 94-104
- Law and order issue, 148, 149
- Lawyers: teamed with community organizers, 103; for the poor, 103; teamed with social workers, 99-100
- "Legal Rights for All People," 16-20
- Legal services, for the poor, 97
- Leviton, Sar A., quoted, 85
- Lindblom, Charles E., quoted, 60
- Lippitt, Ronald, cited, 107-8; quoted, 105
- Los Angeles: fatherless families in Negro slums, 7, 80*n.*; poverty, 79*n.*
- McCoy, Charles B., quoted, 35, 43
- "Man in the house" welfare rule, 165
- Manpower Report of the President (1968), 81, 82
- Manpower Training and Development Act, 84-85
- Mark, St., quoted, 20
- Marshall Kaplan, Gans, and Kahn, 69
- Mathewson, Kent, paper by, 33-44
- "Maximum feasible participation," 13, 61
- Medicaid program (New York State), 27
- Medicare, 54
- "Message from the President-Elect," 164-68
- Metropolitan areas, defined, 79*n.*
- MFY, *see* Mobilization for Youth
- Michigan Bell Telephone Co., 39
- Miller, Arjay, 29
- Minimum wage, as social priority, 54
- Mobilization for Youth (MFY), 102-3; welfare recipients and, 100-101
- Model cities program, 61, 62, 63, 72*n.*, 73, 76
- Morris, Dan, paper by, 94-104
- Morris, Robert, quoted, 95
- Moynihan, Daniel P., 23; quoted, 7
- NAACP, *see* National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
- NABSW, *see* National Association of Black Social Workers
- NASW, *see* National Association of Social Workers
- National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (Kerner Commission), 7, 64-69, 81-82, 86, 94, 145, 157, 164-65; Riot Commission Report, 5, 145

- National Alliance of Businessmen, 24, 53
 National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, 105, 113-14; periodicals and publications of, 109
 National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), 42
 National Association of Black Social Workers (NABSW), 152, 160
 National Association of Manufacturers, 24
 National Association of Social Workers (NASW), 108, 113; Commission on Practice, 115-16; periodicals and publications of, 109
 "National Communication System in Social Welfare, A," 105-25
 National Conference on Social Welfare (NCSW): business organization, 1968, 223-29; centennial anniversary (1973), 123; Distinguished Service Awards, xvii-xix; periodicals and publications of, 109, 120-21; press coverage, 121-22; program, 1968, 169-222; proposed information centers, 122; publications of, 117, 120; public relations, 122; purpose, 159; report of Annual Forum (1968), 156-63; role of, in communications, 119-25; role of, in planning and social action, 106-7; theme, ix, 169
 National Industrial Conference Board, 24, 29
 National Public Relations Council, 117
 National Urban Coalition, 166
 National Welfare Rights Organization, 158, 160
 NCSW, *see* National Conference on Social Welfare
 Negative income tax, 29
 Negroes: alienation of, 72; black power, 145-46; families of, 80-81; incomes policies for, in urban slums, 88-93; NABSW, 160; unemployment among, 81-82; white professionals and, 75; work and income policies in slums, 78-93
 Neighborhood schools, 149-50
 Newburgh plan (1961), 24
 New Deal, and urban planning, 59
 New Detroit Committee, 34, 35, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42; subcommittees of, 43-44
 New Orleans, unemployment in, 81
 New York City: Department of Social Services, 101-2; legal services for the poor, 101-2; low-income families, 82; Mobilization for Youth, 100-104; poverty, 79*n.*; urban planning, 65, 72
 New York State: Board of Social Welfare, 22; legal services for the poor, 101-2; Medicaid program, 27
 Oakland (Calif.), 65, 72, 73, 74, 76; urban planning, 62
 OEO, *see* Office of Economic Opportunity
 Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), 19, 54, 61, 62, 85
 Omnibus Crime Control bill, 11
 Orshansky, Mollie, 79*n.*
 "Partnership between Social Work and Law: an Essential for Effective Community Organization," 94-104
 "Perceptions of Social Development at Home and Abroad," 126-40
 Perlis, Leo, paper by, 45-57
 Pernell, Ruby B., paper by, 126-40
 Pittsburgh, welfare and business cooperation in, 38
 Politics, and urban planning, 58-59
 Poor people: and the courts, 98; and the law, 96-97, 98; lawyers for, 103; social change programs, 96
 Poor People's March (1968), 3, 147, 156, 160
 "Poor power," 146
 Poverty, 6; as area of social work, 18; areas of, 79; and denial of legal rights, 19; elimination of, 141-55; in fatherless families, 80-81; and inner city, 54-55, 61; prevention of, as societal goal, 50; social work's recognition of, 134; in U.S., 46
 PPG Industries, 38
 Project Enable, 13
 Protestant work ethic, 30, 31; and work policies for the poor, 83
 Public assistance, 23
 Public relations, and social welfare communication, 118
 Public welfare: crisis in, 7; criticisms of programs, 8-9; expenditures for, 5-6; "man in the house" rule, 165; Medicaid, 27; MFY and welfare recipients, 100-101; recent developments, 22; re-

- cipients, 25; traditional administration, 26-27
 Public works programs, as social priority, 53

 Racism, 144, 146
 Real Property Actions and Proceedings Law (New York), 102
 "Reason and Responsibility in the Elimination of Bigotry and Poverty," 141-55
 Rein, Martin, quoted, 95
 Riessman, Frank, cited, 13
 Right-to-work laws, elimination of, as social priority, 54
 Riot Commission, *see* National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders
 Riot Commission Report, *see* National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders
 Rohrllich, George F., paper by, 78-93
 Rothwax, Harold, paper by, 94-104
 Rustin, Bayard, quoted, 7

 San Francisco, urban planning in, 62, 65, 69-71, 72
 "San Francisco Story, The," 156-63
 SCAN (Short Conference Abstracts and Notes), 120
 Settlement house movement, 134-35
 Shapiro, Iris, cited, 116
 Sheen, Bishop Fulton J., quoted, 32
 Short Conference Abstracts and Notes (SCAN), 120
 Simmons, Dick, 39
 Slums, *see* Urban slums
 Social action, 94; participation in, 50, 52; in India, 138; role of NCSW in, 106-7
 Social and Rehabilitation Service (of HEW), 108; periodicals and publications of, 109
 Social assistance program, 90-91
 Social casework, 132, 139
Social Casework, 116
 Social change, 94; programs of, with poor, 96
 Social development, domestic and foreign, 126-40
 Social group work, 132, 139
 Social policy, popular participation in formulation of, 21-32

 "Social Policy: 'We, the People,' Must Act," 21-32
 Social reform, 49, 50, 136
 Social Security Act: 1962 amendments, 8-9; 1967 amendments, 11, 12, 23, 157, 161, 165
Social Service Review, 116
 Social welfare: Arden House conference, 23-24; and business community, 33-44; communication in, 105-25; criticism of, 157; priorities, 45-57; recent developments, 22; responsibility for ghetto problems, 7, 8; umbrella organizations, 106, 109
 Social work: and business community, 33; in developing countries, 131-34; and ghetto problem, 7; and law, in community organization, 94-104; in U.S., 134-40
Social Work, 116
 Social work education, in developing countries, 133-34, 139
 Social workers: as advocates, 95; as change agent, 36; constructive workers and, 131-35; teamed with lawyers, 99-100; shortcomings of, 9, 12
 Solender, Sanford, quoted, 114-15
 Sparer, Edward V., quoted, 96
 Speakers' Index, 120
 Subemployment: nonwhite, 81-82; statistics on, 82
 Supreme Court, U.S., 66; efforts at weakening authority of, 11

 Taber, Merlin, cited, 116
 Tax-exempt status of organizations, 30
 Tax laws, revision of, as social priority, 56
 Teaching Aides, Corps of (proposed), 87
 Titmuss, Richard, cited, 10
 Touche, Ross, Bailey, and Smart (Detroit), 39
 Toynbee, Arnold, cited, 45; quoted, 4, 142

 Umbrella organizations, 106; periodicals and publications of, 109
 Unemployment: National Alliance of Businessmen, 24; among Negroes, 81-82; in slums, 81; statistics, 82; welfare recipients and, 28
 Underemployment, statistics on, 82

- United Farm Workers, 160-61
- United Foundation (Detroit), 37
- United States: change in national mood, 4; metropolitan Negro and white population, 78-79; population, 16-19; poverty, 6; social work, 134-40
- Urban blight, elimination of, as social priority, 55
- Urban Coalition (Detroit), 34
- Urban League, 144; Harlem Prep school, 146
- Urban planners, 59; as advocates, 63-72; working with Negroes, 75
- Urban planning: advocacy and, 58-77; citizen participation, 74-75; decision-making, 62; determining local priorities, 76-77; interracial cooperation, 75; and New Deal, 59; planning commissions, 58; priorities, 65; value system, 75-76
- Urban slums: Negro families, 80-81; Negro unemployment, 81; work and income policies for Negroes, 78-93
- Value system, in urban planning, 75-76
- Values, of current society, 31
- Vasey, Wayne, papers by, 3-15, 156-63
- Vietnam, peace in, as social priority, 55-56
- VISTA, 101
- Volunteers, work of, with New Detroit Committee, 37-38
- War on poverty, 61, 62, 63
- Watts (Los Angeles): fatherless families in Negro slums, 80n.; poverty, 79n.; unemployment, 81
- Weinberger, Paul, quoted, 118
- Welfare, *see* Public welfare; Social welfare
- Welfare amendments, *see* Social Security amendments
- "Welfare as a Catalyst for Social and Political Change," 3-15
- Welfare rights organizations, 27-28
- White Citizens Council, 144
- Wilson, Joseph C., 23-24
- Wolfbein, Seymour L., cited, 89
- "Work and Incomes Policies for the Negro in Urban Slums," 78-93
- Young, Whitney M., Jr., 166; cited, 164; paper by, 141-55; quoted, 10
- Youth, as area of social work, 18; job training for, 85; social policy on, 31

Other Volumes from the 95th Annual Forum

Papers presented at the 95th Annual Forum may also be found in *Social Work Practice, 1968* (published by Columbia University Press), and in *Politics and the Ghettos* (published by Atherton Press):

SOCIAL WORK PRACTICE, 1968

Community Organization: for Political Power or Service Delivery? *Arnold Gurin*
and *Joan Levin Ecklein*

Three Models of Community Organization Practice *Jack Rothman*

Community Development—Whither Bound? *Arthur Dunham*

The Economic Development of the Inner City *Harold H. Weissman*

The World of Social Group Work *Ronald A. Feldman* and *Harry Specht*

Family Planning and Social Work *Eunice Minton*

Reducing Stress: Clients and Social Workers *Phyllis A. Rochelle*

The Foster Grandparent Program *Bernard E. Nash*

Legally Reported Child Abuse: a Nationwide Survey *David G. Gil*

Systems Approach to Managing Welfare Programs *Robert Elkin*

Eligibility Declaration in Public Assistance *Sydney E. Bernard*

Peace and Disarmament as a Social Work Objective *Arthur J. Katz*

POLITICS AND THE GHETTOS

Politics and Ghetto Perpetuation *Norton E. Long*

COMMENTS *Martin Rein*

The Ghettos and Metropolitan Politics *Robert C. Wood*

COMMENTS *James R. Dumpson*

The States and the Ghettos *Charles R. Adrian*

COMMENTS *George H. Esser, Jr.*

The Outlook for Creative Federalism *Daniel J. Elazar*

COMMENTS *Melvin B. Mogulof*

Federal Agencies, National Associations, and the Politics of Welfare

Charles I. Schottland

COMMENTS *Alan D. Wade*

The Ghettos, the New Left, and the Revolutionary Ferment *Tom Hayden*

COMMENTS *Robert H. Binstock*

Planning, Politics, and Social Change *Whitney M. Young, Jr.*

The Ghetto System and the Politics of Welfare *Roland L. Warren*

97907

97907

HV
88
A3
v.95
pt.1

National comferemce on
social welfare.
Social welfare forum.
1968

DATE DUE

BORROWER'S NAME

National

Social
v.95
pt.1

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA



PRINTED IN U.S.A.

